

LC111  
D5

1889



# Rome's Assault on Our Public Schools

---

(BANE AND ANTIDOTE.)

TWO DISCOURSES BY REV. E. R. DILLE, D. D.,


DELIVERED IN THE

First M. E. Church, Oakland, Cal.

AUGUST 25TH AND SEPTEMBER 1ST, 1889;

—BEING—

*Replies to an Address by Rev. Father Gleeson (printed here-  
with), delivered at the Inauguration of St. Mary's  
(Roman Catholic) College, Aug. 11, 1889.*



PRICE, 10 CENTS.

---

LC III  
D5

placed exchange  
11/2/18

# Father Gleeson's Address,

AT THE

## DEDICATION OF ST. MARY'S COLLEGE.

---

It will be very gratifying, I am sure, to a large number of the people of this State to hear of the opening of this institution of learning. The establishment of such an institution has long been regarded by many in the light of a necessity. If it was not erected at an earlier date it was not that its necessity was not understood or that its advantages were not foreseen. It was rather because those who were qualified to act in this matter were not in a position to give effect to so important an undertaking at an earlier period. But, though delayed for the reason I assign, its accomplishment was yet ardently wished for and earnestly expected. This was nothing but what was natural, for the establishment of an institution of this character is a pledge of progress—an assurance of enlightenment. The celebration, then, in which we have been called upon to take part to-day, is not one of an ordinary character. It is, on the contrary, of an exceptionally important nature, having been looked forward to and anxiously expected with more than ordinary interest for a considerable time by a large section of the community. Indeed, next to the establishment of our State University, I know of no other college or academy of learning on this side of the Bay of San Francisco, that has awakened such general interest or that has drawn together on the occasion of its inauguration so large an assemblage as I have witnessed here to-day. It is pleasing to think that the success which has thus far attended this opening, at least in the point of numbers has been in every sense equal to the expectations which have been indulged in by the friends and well wishers of this work. Nor should this be at all a matter of surprise, for considering the work that this institution is expected to do and which it is likely to accomplish, it would be rather astonishing had not so deep and lively an interest been manifested in it by the general community.

The advantages under which this seat of learning starts on its career of usefulness are indeed of a very exceptionally favorable character. In fact few institutions of a like nature have had, at the outset, so much in their favor. Located here, in the very heart of this flourishing burgh—this Athens of the Pacific Coast—with its delightful and salubrious climate—within easy reach of San Francisco, in close proximity with the chief institution of learning on this Coast, in possession of an admittedly competent staff of able instructors, added to the general good feeling now existing in its favor, it would indeed be most disappointing and entirely to be unexpected did not the College of St. Mary's of Oakland, become one of the chief educational establishments of this great Republic. But what, it may be enquired, will be the character of the instruction that will be imparted in this college? Will it be of a kind and of a standard that will meet the approval and satisfy the requirements of the people of our time? I answer unhesitatingly in the affirmative, and I say—"yes." It is proposed, as far as I understood the scope of the work to be done, to turn out from these halls of learning, accomplished, well trained scholars—youths capable of taking their places creditably in all the honorable departments of life in the community. It is proposed to prepare and qualify young men here for engaging in all the useful and profitable pursuits of human industry in the community; it is proposed to train them for entering upon the various liberal professions. In short, within these walls is to be imparted a thorough



and high standard of education, which will embrace a commercial, mathematical, classic and English course.

But is that all that is aimed at by the projectors of this work? By no means. Were that to be the extent of the labors of the men who are now entering upon the duties of this college, not a brick would have been laid in these walls. The object in view is not merely to turn out capable commercial, scientific and classic graduates. It is not merely to furnish the learned professions with young men of trained, disciplined habits and cultured minds. But, if I rightly understand what is intended, and I think I do, it is to do much more than this. What is that more? It is to give to the community young men whose training, acquirements and principles will render them ornaments to society and guardians and defenders of the interests of the people. This country is at present becoming alarmed at the crimes, the excesses and dishonesty of many of the public servants. Men are beginning to see and understand that something additional is needed for a competent public official than merely technical qualification for office. They are beginning to see that neither bonds nor prison nor public opinion nor social ostracism are of themselves enough to restrain the average man from the commission of crime when the temptations of unfaithfulness are numerous and strong. In a word, the record of the number and magnitude of the public defalcations which have occurred and are constantly occurring in this land is beginning to open the eyes of the more thoughtful and reflective in the community to the usefulness and even necessity of the inculcation of ethical principles in connection with the education of youths, and this if I mistake not very much, is why institutions of this kind are growing steadily in favor and popularity with the best and most conservative men of our times. The work then, that this college proposes to do, will be of a dual character, that is to say, it will be of an intellectual and moral kind. It will develop the intellectual faculty and cultivate the moral instincts. By the former it will provide the community with capable officers, and by the latter with faithful servants. Thus it will become an agent for general good and a powerful factor in promoting and guarding the common interests. I say a powerful factor in promoting the common interests, for from this institution will go forth in all human probability, as time rolls by, several, if not very many of those gifted youths who, as they come to take their place in society, will become the leaders, the guides and representatives of the people—men who will occupy some of the highest offices within the gift of the community—who will be amongst the administrators of justice, the expounders of law and the defenders of the interests of the populace—men, in a word, whose voice will be heard at the bar, on the bench, and in the Senate.

And how important is it not, to have men of this class in positions of trust, for what greater blessing can a community enjoy than an incorruptible judiciary—an enlightened and unpurchasable legislature and faithful, conscientious civil authorities. I will not insist for a moment on the inculcation of so elementary a truth, for it must be clear to the minds of all. But the work that this institution has cut out for itself does not stop even here. It has a still higher and nobler mission to accomplish—that is to prepare for eternity those of our faith who will be entrusted to its care—to prepare for the attainment of that noble and magnificent destiny for which God called us all into existence those Catholic youths who shall enter under its roof. This is the special, the principal object for which this College has been erected. And this now leads us very naturally to enquire how far a Christian combined with a secular education, is superior to merely a secular one. As you are aware there are two contradictory opinions entertained by the people of this country hereon. The one advocates and insists on the exclusion of all ethical principles from the region of the school room, while the other equally as strongly calls for and demands their introduction. The upholders of the former, unfortunately for us, as well as for those who share our convictions, being entirely in the majority and having the power in their hands, enforce without scruple or regard for the interests of the minority, their ideas and will in this matter. Now, this seems to me a very illiberal, not to say illogical position for any party in the community to assume. It is illiberal and unfair because it forces a system of



instruction on the unwilling acceptance of millions, regardless of their rights and interests, and it is illogical and inconsistent inasmuch as it is a conflict with the history, the traditions and the professions of this country as a Christian nation. If the advocates of the present system of public instruction in this country were to abjure the Christian religion—if they were to proclaim themselves to the world as unbelievers in Christian teaching, their position would be consistent and intelligible; but as long as they bear the Christian name, as long as they are pleased to be known as the followers of the Redeemer of mankind, I see nothing but inconsistency and contradiction in their efforts to prevent the youth of the nation being educated in a Christian way. The present system of non-Christian education now prevailing in this land might be, and doubtless would be admirably adapted, as far as principles are concerned, to a non-Christian country. It would be quite in place, as far as Christian teaching is concerned, in the dominions of his royal majesty, the Sultan of Turkey, or in those of his royal brother, the Shah of Persia. But for this country, which is Christian in religion, Christian in traditions, Christian in government and sentiment, the present system is simply an anachronism. It is out of time and place. Do those who uphold it really wish that this country should remain what it is, a believing nation? If they do, then let them explain the paradox of wishing a country to believe, without teaching it to believe. Of course, I know the puerile answer that many would return to this. It would be the old stereotyped one, that religion is for the church and not for the schools, and that a nation can be Christian without being taught to believe in connection with secular instruction. Unfortunately for those who advance this reason, it has to be acknowledged that one-half of the people of this country never enter an ecclesiastical edifice of any denomination whatever. How, then, I ask, are the youth of the country to be made Christian? Perhaps some may say by means of the Sunday school, but the half of them don't go to Sunday school, and if they did, it would amount to but little. For, what can a youth learn in an hour on Sunday? The Sunday school I regard as little better than a sham, a delusion and a mockery. Under such circumstances it is surely not to be wondered at that millions are ceasing to be Christians in this land.

The fact is the country is becoming to a large extent non-Christian. Statistics have been published in San Francisco, showing that 30,000,000 of the inhabitants of this Republic have never been baptized. What does that mean? It establishes, I think, very clearly the fact that to a large extent we are Christian only in name. Perhaps this is the reason why the present system of education is so earnestly upheld by so many. If so, let its abettors avow their belief, and their advocacy and position will be consistent and intelligible. But if they will not, at least the God-fearing, right-minded, conscientious men of all denominations in the land ought not to allow themselves to be deluded any longer, and they should ask themselves the question, how far the present system of education in this country is responsible for the lack of belief that prevails in this land. I know, of course, that there are many well-meaning, honorable, high-minded Christian men in the community who are zealous upholders of the present system of public instruction. But have these ever examined the system attentively; have they considered its tendencies and marked its results? I think not. On the contrary, they take it for granted that it is a good, an excellent, aye, a most perfect system. They are strongly prejudiced in its favor; and so when anyone raises his voice against it, or attempts to point out its defects, they become irritable and excited, and like the silversmith of Ephesus they raise a mighty commotion against us. The fact is the present system of education in this land is to the people of this country what that ugly, ill-shaped ærolite, which was worshipped in the temple of Ephesus as a goddess in the days of St. Paul, was to the people of Asia Minor. That is, it is the great Diana of the Ephesians, and woe to the man who dares to attack it rudely. But like the Ephesian deity, it is worshipped because it is not understood, for when stripped of its tinsel and gaudy surroundings, it is anything but the lovable object people take it to be; nay, it

is a mighty, monstrous, insatiable Moloch to which the spiritual existence of millions of our little ones is being constantly sacrificed.

Having now directed your attention to the inconsistency of this non-Christian system of education in a Christian land, I will next ask you to consider the dangers and alarmingly deplorable consequences that are certain to result herefrom if persevered in for any considerable time. And when I speak of dangers and deplorable consequences I do not wish to be understood as employing these terms in the religious, but rather in the temporal—national sense. Later on I will show how religion is affected by this system, but for the present I desire you to view it in connection with national interests and national prosperity. In formulating the statement then that the present mode of instruction in use in this country is dangerous and hostile to the dearest and best interests of the Republic there are many, I am sure, who can readily imagine that I am attempting too much, for there are those, and indeed I suppose they are in the majority in this land, who actually believe that the prosperity of this country is dependent on the present system of education. They really, I believe, look upon it as the very basis of social order—the pillars of the Republic and the panoply and palladium of our national greatness.

Now to disabuse such persons of this most erroneous idea, I would ask them if they have ever considered on what national greatness and national prosperity must necessarily rest in order to be permanent. What is the basis of public order—how is a nation's security to be attained? Very likely such persons will tell me, by education—by enlightening the masses. True, but not by education in the pagan or non-Christian sense, for instruction to be a guarantee of permanency to the State must be of a religious character, inasmuch as the Christian republic reposes on moral principles, which, if withdrawn or ignored, the entire superstructure must necessarily come down with a crash.

Enlightenment alone is not sufficient to secure permanency to a nation. The history of the world is an evidence of this. Babylon and Egypt and Greece and Rome were enlightened and highly cultured in the pagan sense, but where are they now? They fell, because the basis on which they reposed was of a perishable character, it was not immortal, for there is no immortal basis upon which nations can repose save that furnished by Christ Jesus in the divine, imperishable principles of the Christian religion. We have with us in this matter of the necessity of combining religions with secular instruction in the training of youth some of the greatest statesmen that have ever lived.

The greatest and wisest statesmen that ever lived have acknowledged this. With your permission I will quote some extracts from their writings, showing their views on this matter. And to begin with this country and with one whose name is revered by every loyal American—I mean George Washington.

In his farewell address, that illustrious man speaks of the religious and moral dispositions of the people as intimately connected with national prosperity, as being the very props and pillars on which human greatness necessarily rests. These are his words: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with public and private felicity. Let it simply be asked where the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligations desert the oath, which are the instruments of investigation in the courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of a peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles." How important then according to the opinion of this illustrious man, is not the inculcation of moral principles into the minds of the young. And again, the same great authority, as if in anticipation of the efforts that later on were to be made by his countrymen in essaying to teach moral obligations without the aid of relig-



ion, says: "Beware of the man who attempts to inculcate morality without religion." Yet, in the face of this I may say dying declaration of this country's greatest champion, we have men calling themselves patriots—men calling themselves lovers of their country's well being, doing all in their power—working with might and main to support a system of education that rigidly excludes from the school room the presence of religion. Have such persons ever attentively read and carefully weighed the meaning of Washington's words "of all the dispositions and habits that lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports?"

If we turn now to the great statesmen of Europe we will find the same expression of sentiment uttered by them in regard to the importance and necessity of the inculcation of ethical principles in case of the young. Thus that eminent Protestant minister, Portalis, who discharged the office of public instructor under Napoleon I, said:

"There is no instruction without education, and no proper education without morality and dogma. We must take religion as the basis of education; and if we compare what the instruction of the present day is with what it ought to be, we cannot help deploring the lot which awaits and threatens the present and future generations." This was thoughtful language; it was written, as one whose name I cannot recall, has well remarked, by the lurid glare of the torch that has set all France in a blaze; it was written in the presence of hecatombs of victims that had fallen before the popular fury that had been sacrificed to the wild passions of the mob; it was written, in fine, by a man who was deploring the civil disasters that had befallen his country, and who was ready to trace them to the genuine source—the want of proper religious instruction.

Another even more eminent Protestant statesman and minister of public instruction under Louis Philippe—I mean Francois Guizot, asserted the same only in different words. "In order to make popular education (said this eminent man) truly good and socially useful (mark that) it must be fundamentally religious. I do not simply mean by this that religious instruction should hold its place in popular education and that the practice of religion should enter into it; for a nation is not religiously educated by such petty mechanical devices. It is necessary that national education (I wish you would mark this) should be given and received in the midst of a religious atmosphere, and that religious impressions and religious observances should penetrate into all its parts." No Catholic layman or Catholic clergyman could speak stronger than that. And what France's ablest statesmen have said in this regard has been echoed by England's foremost men.

"Religion is not (says Lord Derby) a thing apart from education, but is interwoven into its whole system. It is a principle which controls and regulates the whole mind and happiness of the people. Public education should be considered as inseparable from religion." "Religion (says Lord Russell) should regulate the entire system of discipline. \* \* \* To omit any inculcation of the duties of religion—to omit instructing the children in the principles of the love of God and the love of their neighbor, would be a grave, a serious and irreparable fault."

Now listen to what that very eminent statesman, Sir Robert Peel, said on this matter: "I am (said he) for a religion as opposed to a secular education. I believe that such an education is only half an education, but with the most important half neglected." So say all we Catholics, and so say also a large number of non-Catholics in this country, and though the majority be against us now, yet we hopefully look forward to the day when they will be on our side and as ardent supporters as we are of religious combined with secular instruction. I will not trespass on your patience any further in this matter of quotation only while I put before you the sentiments of two more eminent statesmen, the one a German and the other an Englishman, but both non-Catholic. In 1879, Her Von Puttkamer, then Minister of Public Instruction, said: "I am convinced that on the day on which we cease to make the saving teachings of the gospel the basis of education, the fall of our national civilized life will be inevitable." I would earnestly recommend the serious consideration of that statement to the men of this country who are wholly in favor of secular as opposed

to secular combined with religious instruction. And I would also recommend to the attention of the same the opinion of that great and noble-hearted Englishman, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, the "Grand Old Man," as he is called. "Every system," says Mr. Gladstone, "which places religious education in the background is pernicious." Mind you, Mr. Gladstone does not merely say that the purely secular system is defective, but he says it is pernicious.

The present system of education then, in this country, stands condemned in the light of the utterances of some of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced. It is a system that rests upon a popular fallacy, that is, that you can have a people moral and virtuous without being taught to be such in the schools. Nowhere in the world can an instance of this nature be pointed to as an example. On the contrary, unbelief is the natural consequence of such a system, and the very moment that Christian principles are discarded by the masses, that moment the country is in danger, for, as the immortal Washington has well remarked, "religion and morality are the indispensable supports of the nation." Who are the men, I will ask, from whom national danger may be most reasonably expected? Is it from the God-fearing, law-abiding, morally-instructed section of the community? Is it not rather from the Socialists, the Anarchists and bomb-throwers of the country, and are not such persons uniformly recruited from the ranks of the infidels and agnostics of this land? The history of these worthies, especially in the city of Chicago, informs us of what they are capable of attempting, and what might be expected if their principles were generally accepted. On purely utilitarian principles, then, I hold that it is a duty that the people of this country owe to themselves to see that the present system of common school education prevailing in these United States be reformed, for if there be anything of value to be attached to the opinions of the eminent statesmen from whom I have quoted, it is certain that this system contains the germs of public disorder and of national calamity. The full extent of the evil may not now be easily forecast, but if the system be continued, the day will come—it is bound to come—when, as unbelieving, socialistic principles will take the place of Christian ethics, a storm of popular fury will sweep this land from the Atlantic to the Pacific, leaving nothing but ruin and desolation in its track.

I now turn to another aspect of this educational question. Up to this I have endeavored to point out to you its shortcomings, its unsuitableness as a system of education in a Christian land and its dangers in regard to society. I will now advance a step further and will ask you to consider with me its unfairness to the Catholics of this Republic. Unfortunately for us Catholics, we are not properly understood in this matter. For one reason or another, the general public accredit us with a most intense and insensate hatred of the system in all its parts and forms. It is thought that we see nothing but evil in everything connected with it. Now this is not exactly our position. It is true that we disclaim against the system and mainly on account of its want of moral principles, but we are willing to acknowledge that there are things in the public school system of education, such as reading, writing and arithmetic, that are admirable, and which, if we were in a position to-morrow, we would not alter, but can the same be said of everything else? No, indeed. Take for instance, the department of history. Is this taught in a way that Catholics can approve of or that leaves them without a reasonable ground for complaint? Is there nothing deficient in this branch of instruction? I wish, indeed, I were able to answer in the negative and say no. But unhappily I am not, for, as now taught, the most important points of Christian history are kept carefully out of sight; they are wholly ignored, not being so much as alluded to, and so the system in this respect remains lamentably deficient, sadly imperfect, and consequently entirely below the standard that we have a right to expect.

The youth of our times and of our faith are accordingly kept in the profoundest ignorance of what they ought to know. Thus it is a historic fact that all the civilization of the world is Christian and has been created by the Catholic Church—who were the men who went forth as the apostles of religious and intellectual enlightenment while the nations of Europe were still in a

condition of barbarism? Who lifted woman from her lowly condition as man's reputed inferior, and placed her on a level with her lord and master? Who espoused the cause of the degraded slave and succeeded to a great extent in striking the fetters from his weary limbs, who, I ask, but the Catholic Church and her heroic children. And are these things and others of a similar nature taught to the youth of our time in the public schools of this land? Nothing of the kind—they are kept studiously from the minds of the pupils. Again, whence has civil liberty been obtained, in what does it consist and what are its advantages? Civil liberty, as you are aware, is one of the greatest blessings a man can enjoy. It may be defined the protection by law of the life and property of the citizen. It consists in the provisions, no representation—no taxation, no trial—no condemnation, no crime—no punishment.

These are the basis of the liberties of the people of this land and of all enlightened countries to-day in the world, and whence, I ask, have they been derived? Is it from a pagan or non-Catholic source? Nothing of the kind. They have come down to us from the old Catholic times, they are as ancient as the days of Alfred the Great, and when for a time, they were forfeited to the people by the exactions of an arbitrary monarch, was it not by a Catholic people led by an illustrious Catholic archbishop that they were restored to their place in the government of the nation, on the ever memorable and historic plains of Runnymede. Whence, too, may I ask, have the principles of the common law of this and other civilized nations been derived? Most assuredly from the Canon or ecclesiastical law of our ancient Church, for our common law, which is the basis of our entire system of jurisprudence, is nothing but the development or the application of the Canon law to civil cases. And now, I ask once more, are such things as these ever taught our Catholic youth in the public schools of this land? Indeed they are not. They are not even hinted at, and so our young people are kept in the profoundest ignorance of what they ought, and have a right to know. May I not fairly ask then, is that a just—an equitable system—that keeps our people in shameful ignorance of what they ought to know?

And as it is in these instances which I have now mentioned, so it is in every other where the honor and the glory of the Catholic Church is concerned. In other words, everything that can in any way tell for the credit of our holy religion is either kept out of view, or if mentioned at all, is set forth in so meagre and half-hearted a way as to convey only a mere moiety of the truth. Hence it is not surprising that there are constantly leaving the schools of this country, Catholic youths who are in the profoundest ignorance of many of the grandest truths of Christian history, as if these had never been written. They leave these schools without the remotest idea, without the slightest suspicion of what the Catholic Church has done for the interest of science and the diffusion of general knowledge. Nay, it is even more likely that they go forth with the impression that the Catholic Church has been an impediment, a stumbling block in the way of learning. And, so, if you ask them who have been the greatest patrons of learning in the world, who have done most to bring knowledge within the reach of the masses, the last names that will occur to their minds will be those of the Popes of Rome.

If you ask them who have been the founders of the great universities of the world—who pushed forward the landmarks of knowledge—to whom are we indebted for the inductive or experimental method of study by which such magnificent results have been obtained in the natural and physical sciences—if you ask them who were the men who gave the greatest impetus to astronomical study while that department of learning was still in its infancy—who led the way in mathematical discovery, in all probability the youths of whom I speak will reply by saying that they are matters to which their attention was never directed. And then if you tell them that the greatest names on the roll of science—the Descartes, the Bacons, the Albertus, the Magnuses, the Gerberts, the Brahes, the Copernicuses, the DeNincis, and a host of others hardly less celebrated, were all, all Catholics; if you tell them that to an Egyptian monk we are indebted for the first correct ideas that were

ever had regarding the geography of the globe, that to a Roman monk is to be attributed the honor of having introduced into Europe the first system of chronology, that to the famous abbot Gassendi belongs the glory of being the first to observe the transit of Mercury over the disc of the sun; that to Piazzi, a Theatine monk, is to be accorded the praise of having discovered the first of the asteroids; that Orioli, a Catholic priest, was the first to determine the orbit of the planet Uranus; that it was a Catholic Leverrier, who discovered Neptune, the most distant planet of the solar system. If you tell them these and a thousand like things equally creditable to our holy religion, all this will come upon them like a revelation from Heaven and they will acknowledge with shame and chagrin that they have never been properly taught.

And now may I not fairly ask once more, is this a system that we Catholics can heartily endorse, with which we can be expected to be content? But it is not merely that the system of public school education in this country is defective in leaving out what it ought to teach, and thereby keeping the youth of our times in shameful ignorance of what they ought to know, but I furthermore charge it as being a vehicle of gross untruth. Don't imagine that I have come here to-day to make a statement of this nature without being able to substantiate it. Well, many of you may have heard of the commotion that was raised in Boston a couple of years ago by the introduction into the public schools of that city of a book in which it was stated that the doctrine of indulgences was a pardon for sins, and that as such the Catholic Church commended their sale. Now, I need not go so far as Boston to find something of a like nature to this. The general history used in the higher grades in the public schools on this Coast, up to very recently, and as far as I know may even yet, in some instances, has been Barnes' and at page 438 of that work the author thus expresses himself on the subject of indulgences: "In 1517, there came into Saxony, one Tetzel, a Dominican Friar (mark the discourteous language, one Tetzel) selling indulgences. The wickedness and impudence of this man, who was better fitted to receive than dispense pardon for sin, aroused general indignation." Now, if this means anything at all, it means that indulgences are a pardon for sin, and that as such they were sold by the Catholic Church. Again at page 321, the same writer tells his young readers that it was only in the sixth century that the Pope of Rome became the head of the Catholic Church.

When speaking of the conversion of the Lombards to Christianity, he says: "The people, who until the overthrow of the Emperor had been accustomed to depend upon Rome for political guidance, naturally continued to look thither for spiritual control and (now mark you) the Bishop of Rome insensibly became head of the Catholic Church." That is, it was by political circumstances that the Bishop or Pope of Rome became the head of our holy Church. What a monstrous, what a shameful and barefaced untruth! Mr. Barnes may be, in social and domestic life, an excellent man, of that I have no knowledge, but one thing I do know, and that is that he is not qualified to write a general history for the Catholic youth of this Coast.

Still again, at page 265 of the same work, the same writer complacently tells us that Julian the Apostate, the greatest enemy the Christian cause ever had on earth, not even excepting the cruel Nero or the bloody Dioclesian, was an excellent man. And that is the history that the Catholics of our public schools are required to learn, that is the history that Catholic parents are required to purchase and put into the hands of their sons and daughters to learn. This, I indignantly declare is an insult to our reason, and an indignity to our faith. It is an evil that should not be tolerated to exist for a day in our midst. And now what is the remedy for such a condition of things as this? What is it that we Catholics have a just right to demand under the circumstances? It is beyond all manner of contradiction a change, a reformation of the entire system, and such a reformation as will bring back the system to its original condition, to its first principles. For it must be remembered that when first started, the public school system of this country was not what it is now.

Then it was Christian, now it is anti-Christian. Then it was religious,

now it is secular. Then, in a word, the persons having it in charge, proceeded on the lines of making virtuous citizens by the dual process of moral combined with secular instruction, while now the same is attempted by purely secular means. Again the Catholics claim and call for a reformation of this matter for the reason that, as now administered, it is in direct conflict with the spirit and letter of the constitutional law of this Republic, which secures to each of us, independent of creed or persuasion, an absolute freedom from all religious intolerance, while here we have forced on us by the will of the majority a system of instruction which we are ready to show has been and is robbing our little ones by the thousand and by the million of what is dearer to them than their very existence—the faith of their fathers. Who gave the State the absolute dominion over the finances of the whole country for such an ignoble purpose as this? Was it the object for which the public school system of this country was established, to destroy the faith of the Catholic people?

It is a principle laid down in that magnificent document, the Declaration of Independence, drawn up in 1776, that there shall be no taxation without representation. It had been the violation of that principle on the part of the King of England that led to the achievement of the liberties of this country. For be it understood, that it was not the taxation of the colonies, but the taxation without representation that led to the war of Independence. When, then, you support or indorse a system of this nature, you strike at the very root of constitutional liberty—you sap the very foundation on which our national greatness as a great liberal nation repose, and so sooner or later, the evil consequences of such a proceeding are certain to be felt—sooner or later the bitter fruits of such a policy are certain to be tasted. What, then, is the duty of the loyal, God-fearing Christian men of this land? It is to make common cause against this common enemy. It is to check by every means in their power the onward march of the hosts of unbelief and infidelity that are now marching forward with such giant strides through the length and breadth of this great nation, and for the existence of which the common school system is mainly responsible.

Do not imagine that I am alone in entertaining this idea of the spread of unbelief and the cause to which it should be attributed. It has been publicly avowed and frankly acknowledged by the very mouthpiece and apostle of infidelity in this land, for has not the hater of everything Christian, Col. R. Ingersoll, openly declared that he considered the public school buildings of this country as the future cathedrals of the nation. The duty of all loyal, God-fearing, Christian men, then, I repeat it, is to make common cause against the common foe. We should be one and all ready to sink our differences, to put aside our prejudices and to stand shoulder to shoulder in our efforts to keep this land Christian. If the men of other denominations are wise they will join with us in this struggle for reform, for if they do not the loss will be greater for them than for us. For while we, with the efforts we are making, will keep a very large proportion of our people, they will be completely abandoned by their own. Do not imagine that I am alone in entertaining this opinion. It has been acknowledged by some of the ablest and farthest-seeing men of the Protestant community. And not to go beyond the city of San Francisco for instance, the Rev. Dr. Platt, of Grace Church, used the following remarkable words twelve years ago in connection with this affair:

Extract from Dr. Platt's sermon: "As Protestants we should Christianize our education, because, first, if our secular schools were intended exclusively to build up Protestantism, they are a great blunder, for they are breaking it down. \* \* \* Secular schools in the interest of Protestantism are a fatal blunder. \* \* \* Secularism saves nothing, not even itself. As to Protestantism it is only a question of time when our present system of public schools will render it a dead factor. The issue is by these schools narrowing the controversy down to Romanism on the one hand and infidelity on the other. \* \* \* As American citizens, we should Christianize our education. When religion fails, all fails. True liberty and immorality are strangers, but immorality and despotism are allies."

These are remarkable words and deserve to be laid to heart and carefully studied by the entire Protestant community.

In fine, then, we Catholics call for a reformation of the public school system of education, because it is dangerous to the well-being of the community, because it is the parent of infidelity, an abridgement of our constitutional rights and destructive of parental authority.

And now before I leave this place allow me, Brothers of the Christian schools, to say a word to you in particular. To-day you have taken your stand before the community in the great work that you have proposed to accomplish on this Coast. Every eye is now upon you and much is expected, from you. As I have remarked at the outset, you have much in your favor, you commence under the most favorable auspices. Climate, location, the sympathy of the community, and the approval of superiors, all are on your side. If you fail the failure will be your own work, it will be attributed to yourselves. But I have no fears for your success. I have known you for twenty long years, I have lived under the same roof with you, and I know your system of teaching, and so repeat it, I have no fears for your success. But do not imagine that your college will attain distinction and reputation without labor on your part. In the work of instruction you will have many and able competitors, and it will require all the energy and all the ability of which you are possessed to keep ahead in this contest for honorable distinction. Let then, the good religion, the glory of your Institute and the honor of your profession, stimulate you to worthy and generous exertion in the cause in which you are now embarked.

Brothers of the Christian schools, children of De LaSalle, remember your traditions; recall the glory of your Institute. For two hundred years your society has stood before the world as one of the greatest powers for good in the church of God. Let it not be said of you then, that while your brethren have succeeded in every other part of the globe, you, and you alone, failed on the coast of California. But, no, failure is a word that has not yet been written in your history nor shall you be the first to write it. Succeed you shall, the future shall bear witness to this, and St. Mary's of Oakland shall thus become an honor to your name and a glory to the diocese of San Francisco. God speed you then and God bless you.

*"Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's."—Matt. 22:21.*

---

## Sermon by Rev. E. R. Dille, D. D.

DELIVERED AT OAKLAND, CAL., AUG. 25, 1889.

---

ALL true Americans accept the history and philosophy of American institutions, and are loyal to those institutions; and it is certain that among them our system of free popular education holds the foremost place. The American doctrine is that the State, which is the highest of all human organizations, is not only entitled to educate, but where manhood suffrage prevails is solemnly bound to educate all its youth for the responsibilities and duties of citizenship. Says Professor Fisher of Yale College: "The State has a right and a duty which it may not abdicate, to guard its own existence, and to provide for what is essential to its well-being. There can be no parental claim which nullifies that right, for the child has duties to perform as a member of the civil community, as well as obligations within the family circle."

Father Gleeson tells us that the common school is of atheistic origin. The Pilgrim Fathers were the founders of American free schools, and it is news, indeed, that they were atheists.

Lord Macaulay once said in Parliament: "Illustrious forever in history are the founders of the commonwealth of Massachusetts; though their love of freedom of conscience was illimitable and indestructible, they could see nothing servile or degrading in the principle that the State should take upon itself the education of the people. In the year 1642 they passed the first enactment on the subject in the preamble of which they distinctly pledged themselves to the principle." The history of our public schools is one with the history of our country, and it is the height of insolent assumption for the sworn minions of a foreign despot to attack a system about which our fathers and our statesmen have uttered words like these:

The great and good George Washington said, "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of a Republican government."

Jefferson declared nearly a hundred years ago that free schools were an essential part—one of the columns, as he expressed it—of the Republican edifice, and that without instruction free to all, the sacred flame of liberty could not be kept burning in the hearts of Americans.

Madison over sixty years ago said, "A popular government without popular information or means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or tragedy or perhaps both."

James A. Garfield said in his letter of acceptance in July, 1880, "Whatever helps the Nation can justly afford should be generously given to aid the States in supporting common schools, but it would be unjust to our people and dangerous to our institutions to apply any portion of the revenues of the Nation or of the States to the support of sectarian schools."

U. S. Grant said, "Encourage free schools and resolve that not one dollar in money appropriated to their support, no matter how raised, shall be appropriated to the support of any sectarian school. Resolved that either the State or Nation, or both combined, shall support institutions of learning sufficient to afford to every child growing up in the land the opportunity of a good common school education."

Our common schools, then, are the bulwarks of our civil and religious liberty and of the purity and integrity of our republican institutions, they

alone can guard the Nation from that illiteracy which now to millions of Americans makes the Bible and the Constitution of the country a sealed book. And when dismayed at the ignorance and superstition brought to us from foreign lands and dumped by the shipload upon our shores, we thank God and take courage for that wonderful assimilator, the public school, into which the children of all nations enter and come out Americans.

In a government like ours, where political power resides in and springs from the people we must educate, since intelligence in the ruler is the first essential of good government. With us the rulers, the sovereigns are voters, and we our masters, or submit to that worst of despotisms, the tyranny of ignorant and vicious majorities. In a government like ours, to leave the people uneducated, or to allow them to be educated in foreign schools and with foreign ideas, is to invite certain destruction to all we hold dear as patriots and as Americans.

Dr. Schaff once said in one of his great speeches: "This country had its first conflict for its independent existence; its second was for its unbroken unity; the third will be for its institutions." Thanks be to God and the fathers of our Republic, it achieved its independent existence, it preserved its unity, and it will through Heaven's help, maintain its institutions. The most cherished of our institutions, our free schools, are being assailed to-day in every State in this Union by insidious methods and infamous political deals, in which American principles and rights are being bartered by corrupt politicians for foreign votes. There is to-day an organized and persistent attempt, under foreign leadership and under the mask of devotion to liberty of conscience and freedom of work ship, to subject the infant wards of the State to proselyting influences and discipline, and to prevent, by spiritual threats and undue influence the attendance of the children of to-day, who are the voters of to-morrow, upon our public schools, and to pervert to sectarian purposes the sacred school funds.

There is an irreconcilable and irrepressible conflict between the Roman Catholic and the American theories of education, and it is for the American people to say which of them shall go to the wall, for it is war to the death between them.

The Romanist theory of education is:

I. All education, both secular and religious, is the exclusive function of the Papal Church, to be administered in schools under the sole direction and supervision of the church.

II. In a non-Catholic country like ours, where the church cannot control the whole field of education, Roman Catholics must establish parochial schools for Roman Catholic children, and they have a right to a share of the public school funds, to be applied to the support of parochial schools, over which the State shall have no control.

III. Failing in this, that Catholics who support parochial schools ought not to be taxed for public schools.

IV. That when Catholics are so taxed, no text books of instruction injurious to Catholic interests should be allowed.

On the other hand the American theory of education is:

I. That secular education is the function of the State—the duty of self preservation and self development requiring the State to make such education uniform and compulsory. Religious education belongs to the family and the church, and the State permits all denominations who desire to do so, to establish church schools, colleges, and seminaries at their own expense, but it is not consistent with true loyalty to the republic nor with the public safety, for any denomination to maintain schools in which supreme allegiance to a foreign ruler is daily taught, and where the coming voter is trained, as Mr. Gladstone says all Catholics are, to hold his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another. *Therefore every parochial school ought to be closed by law.*

II. That while the common schools may teach the common principles of Christian morals, as does the common law, they are not to give distinctively denominational or sectarian religious instruction. The second amendment to the Constitution provides that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.



III. That the school funds are not to be divided, and that those who contribute to private or parochial schools are not to be exempt from taxation for the public schools.

IV. That State supervision should be so far extended to all private schools as to prevent the mischievous or misleading instruction of those who are to be the future citizens of the State.

The war between these two diametrically opposite theories of education has been going on for forty years. In 1840 Bishop Hughes demanded a division of the school funds of the State of New York, on the ground that the consciences of Catholics were outraged by the reading of the Protestant scriptures in the schools. Rufus Choate said at that time: "Expel the Bible from the schools? Never, while enough of Plymouth Rock remains to make a gun flint!"

Nevertheless they were expelled from the schools of New York and Cincinnati, and from most of the schools of the country, and six States, our own among them, put a provision in their constitutions forever banishing the Bible from the schools. Were the Romanists satisfied? No, they at once raised the cry, "The schools are godless!" It was not because they were afraid of the Bible or the Lord's Prayer that they attacked the schools, but because they objected to Catholic children and Protestant children sitting side by side, and studying the same books, and breathing the same atmosphere of freedom and imbibing the same modern ideas. They know very well that when their children feel the electric touch of liberty they will not believe in holy water and the mummeries of the mass any more. It is not that they want the Douay version of the Bible; they do not have that in their parochial schools; the catechism suits their purpose better. They have no use for the Bible in any form. What they want is to bring the public schools under suspicion as irreligious and ungodly, and then to build up Romish schools on their ruins. The Catholic *Tablet* said after the Bible was banished in Cincinnati: "The expulsion of the Bible does not meet nor in any degree lessen our objection to the public school system." The *Freeman's Journal* says; "Let the public school system go to where it came from—the devil."

In this contest Rome has scored several victories, and this makes her the bolder in her claims to-day. In New Haven and New Britain, Conn., in Manchester, N. H., and in Poughkeepsie, N. Y., the school funds were actually turned over to the priests and Sisters of Mercy, and the parochial schools were supported by the public funds.

In the city of New York during the last seventeen years \$22,932, 086 has been paid out of the public treasury to Roman Catholic institutions, and among these were fifty-six parochial schools. The Tweed ring gave these schools in one year \$800,000. And Connelly, Sweeney, Tweed and A. Oakey Hall gave the church that magnificent block on Fifth Avenue, worth millions of dollars, on which the great Cathedral is now being built *ad maiorem dei gloriam*. To-day  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of the entire tax levy of the city of New York and 6 per cent. of the entire expense of the city government is paid to the Roman Catholic Church, and the Catholics pay but 10 per cent. of the taxes of the city. They receive from the public funds ten times as much as all the other denominations together. And the same state of things exists in all our rum-and-Rome-and-Boss-ruled cities.

Flushed with these victories that naked sword of Jesuitism whose hilt, says the Encyclopedia Britannica, is in Rome and its point everywhere is bared to strike down our school system and the scabbard has been thrown away. It is war to the knife and the knife to the hilt. As long ago as 1858 Archbishop Hughes, in a lecture in New York, said "the public school is a disgrace to the civilization of the eighteenth century." Pope Pius IX in his encyclical of 1864 condemned those institutions which Americans hold dearer than life itself—free speech, free press, a free church, free schools and a free government—as the liberty of perdition, impious, absurd and erroneous doctrines, detestable sentiments pregnant with the most deplorable evils.

In 1872 Catholic children were taken out of the public schools in Holyoke, Mass., and about the same time the Bishop of Cleveland commanded his clergy to refuse the sacraments to all who patronized the public schools.

The last Plenary Council held at Boston, 1884, commanded all Catholics to patronize and support only parochial schools. That decree is being executed. Parochial schools are rising from sea to sea and to-day half a million Catholic children are in them.

A Catholic University with an endowment of \$8,000,000 has been established at Washington. Monsignor Capel, the apostle to the "genteels," an eminent emissary of Romanism, incites a Catholic outbreak by this treasonable language:

"The time is not far away when the Roman Catholics of the Republic of the United States, at the order of the Pope will refuse to pay the school tax, and will send bullets through the breasts of government agents rather than pay it."

Father Walker, of St. Lawrence's Roman Catholic Church, New York, said: "The public schools are nurseries of vice; they are godless schools, and they who send their children to them cannot expect the mercy of God. I would as soon administer the sacrament to a dog as to such Catholics."

Priest McCarthy said in a sermon reported in the *Boston Journal*, Dec. 23, 1887: "The public school is a national fraud. It must cease to exist, and the day will come when it will cease to exist."

According to Sadlier's Roman Catholic Almanac for 1888, there were 2606 parochial schools in this country, and 511,063 pupils in them. In the Catholic schools and institutions of San Francisco there are 10,000 children and youth. I do not know the statistics of Oakland in this regard, but we have just seen St. Mary's College, costing \$200,000, inaugurated with a great flourish of trumpets and by a malignant attack upon the public schools.

On the 8th of May, 1888, Rev. Father Metcalf, rector of a Catholic church in South Boston, complained to the Boston School Board that Mr. Travis, a teacher in the English High School, in the course of a lesson in history, had made offensive statements in regard to the Roman Catholic Doctrine and practice of indulgences. The subservient school board dismissed Mr. Travis from his position in the school and ordered Swinton's history discontinued as a text book. Think of it! In Boston in the Nineteenth century, under shadow of Bunker Hill monument, a public school teacher is compelled to take a true text book of history under his arm and march out with it because he dared to teach the truth of history about indulgences, and another teacher in the same school goes over to Rome because he says he has a family to support, and he is afraid of losing his place. I tell you Swinton's history told the truth about the indulgences. I am glad Rome has the grace to be ashamed of its history on that question, but it will find it a big job to blot out the record, for that record is written in blood. Father Gleeson objects to this passage in one of our text books: "In 1517 there came into Saxony one Tetzal, a Dominican friar, selling indulgences. The wickedness and impudence of this man, who was better fitted to receive than dispense pardon of sin, aroused general indignation."

"Now," said Father Gleeson with an air of virtuous indignation, "if this means anything it means that indulgences were a pardon of sin and that they were sold by the Catholic Church." Were and are, reverend father, and that no one knows better than yourself, only that it suits your purpose to attempt to mystify the whole question with Jesuitical subterfuges. How in the face of history these men can have the audacity to say that Rome never sold indulgences passes comprehension.

Swinton's History was proscribed, because on page 320 it says in a foot note, "These indulgences were, in the early ages of the church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal upon the community. But in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgences was said to be delivered from all his sins."

The question is, is this statement of Swinton true or false? Was an indulgence at the time and place of which Mr. Swinton speaks (Germany, 16th century) understood to mean a remission of sins? Why, unless it was the ninety-five theses of Luther, which were in the main directed against indulgences, had no meaning and the reformation itself had no explanation. Some

things are settled in this 19th century, and the great principles of the reformation are no longer an open question with the American people. Ranke, who tho' not a Catholic, is an authority among Catholics says: "The reformation may be said to have originated in the violent shock which Luther's religious feeling received from the sale of indulgences," which he subsequently described as "the doctrine of a forgiveness of sins for money." But were indulgences sold? The statement that they were shocks Father Gleeson very much. Let me quote Cardinal Gibbons on that point. In "The Faith of Our Fathers," he says (page 390): "I will not deny that indulgences have been abused." He then quotes the Council of Trent as follows: "Wishing to correct and amend the abuses which have crept into them, and on occasion of which this signal name of indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, the holy synod enjoins, in general, by the present decree, that all wicked traffic for obtaining them, which has been the fruitful source of many abuses among Christian people, should be wholly abolished." We thus cannot ask any stronger corroboration of Swinton than this from Cardinal Gibbons himself. He practically acknowledges, and so does the Council of Trent, a "wicked traffic" in indulgences by the hands of John Tetzel in Germany, which gave rise to the Protestant Reformation under Martin Luther. Most important of all, take the evidence of honest Pope Adrian VI, the successor of Leo X. crowned in 1522, when Germany was all ablaze with Lutherism. At the diet of Nuremberg, summoned to deal with Luther, this honest Dutch Pope Adrian declared roundly, through his legate, that "these disorders had sprung from the sins of men, more especially from the sins of priests and prelates. Even in the holy chair" said he, "many horrible crimes have been committed. The contagious disease, spreading from the head to the members, from the Pope to lesser prelates, has spread far and wide, so that scarcely any one is to be found who does right and who is free from infection."

A Catholic who had not the manliness to come out into the open, but skulked under that coward's signature, an assumed name, either because he was ashamed of his cause or his argument, said in a recent newspaper article, that an indulgence does not authorize a man to commit sin, but only delivers him from the penalty of it when it has been committed. Where is the difference? What thief wants permission to steal if, by dividing the swag, he can escape the penalties? I give the definition of the Council of Trent, the definition of the Catholic Church: "An indulgence is the remission, in whole or in part, of the temporal penalty which is due for sins, conferred by an authorized agent of the Church, and having its ground in the treasury of merits which is in the keeping of the Church." Now when Catholics tell us Protestants that the temporal, that is, the terminable penalty of sin is alone remitted by indulgences they strive to carry the impression that the temporal penalty of sin simply consists in the ecclesiastical censures and penances which the Church imposes for the sake of disciplining its subjects, and which it certainly has a right to remit. But the truth is, and I defy any reputable Catholic to deny it, the temporal penalty cancelled by an indulgence may not only be an ecclesiastical penalty, but may be one demanded by divine justice, and by the will of God. Butler and Milner, Roman Catholic theologians, tell us that the temporal punishment remitted by indulgences, includes not only evil in this life, but temporal suffering in the next, which is called purgatory.

Let me quote their exact words. Charles Butler says: "The Roman Catholic Church teaches that God frequently remits the essential guilt of sin and the eternal punishment incurred by it, but leaves a temporal punishment to be incurred by the sinner; that this temporal punishment may consist either of evil in this life, or of temporal suffering in the next—which temporal suffering in the next we call purgatory; that the temporal punishment may consist of both these inflictions, and that the Church has received power from God to remit them either wholly or partially."

John Milner says: "It is the received doctrine of the Church that an indulgence, when truly gained is not barely a relaxation of the canonical penance enjoined by the Church, but also an actual remission by God himself, of the whole or part of the temporal punishment due to it in his sight. The

contrary opinion, though held by some theologians, has been condemned by Leo X and Pius VI. This is taught by Thomas Aquinas (Sum. Theol. III Sup. 25:1), by Leo X in his bull against Luther's teachings, and by the Council of Trent (Session VI. Decree on Justification).

Mosheim tells us that Pope Leo X, in order to carry on the expensive structure of St. Peter's at Rome, published indulgences with a plenary remission to all who should contribute to that object. The right of promulgating these indulgences in Germany, together with a commission on the sale of them was granted to Albert of Metz, Archbishop of Magdeburg, who selected for his chief agent this man John Tetzel, for whose memory (Heaven save the mark!) Father Gleeson enters the lists with lance in rest. Tetzel boasted that he had saved more souls by his indulgences than St. Peter had by his preachings, assured his customers that their crimes, however enormous, would be forgiven, and that if one should even violate the mother of God, the indulgences would free him from both guilt and punishment. This was the form of absolution given by Father Gleeson's patron saint, at whose shrine many a Protestant school teacher and school book has been martyred.

"I, Tetzel, by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of his apostles Peter and Paul, and of the most holy Pope, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; and from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, however enormous they may be. I remit to thee all punishment which thou deservedst in purgatory on their account, and I restore thee to the holy sacraments of the Church, and to that innocence and purity which thou possessedst at baptism—so that when thou diest the gates of punishment shall be shut and the gates of paradise opened, and if thou shalt not die at the present, this grace shall remain in full force when thou art at the point of death." He declared, this friend of Father Gleeson's, that the moment the money tinkled in the chest, the soul for whose release it was paid instantly escaped from the place of torment and ascended to Heaven.

Father Gleeson is stopped from disavowing Tetzel, for the Church is *semper idem* (always the same), and Leo X, who commissioned Tetzel, was an infallible Pope. His bull, "De Indulgentiis," thus defines indulgences: "The Roman Pontiff, vicar of Christ on earth, can for reasonable causes, by the power of the keys, grant to the faithful, whether in life or in purgatory, indulgences out of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints." What blasphemy, to make the atonement of Christ a matter of barter and sale! Clement V granted to all pilgrims who should die on the road to Rome during his jubilee year, a plenary absolution of all sins and commanded the angels to carry them straight to Heaven.

Thus the Lateran Council of 1123, the first œcumenical council held in the West, promised to those who should go to Jerusalem, and aid efficiently in its recovery from the infidel, *remission of their sins* as well as protection of their property. This is promised without specifying any religious condition whatever. Scarcely more guarded was the promise made by Pope Julius II in 1505, that those who should join the campaign of the King of Portugal should have full remission of all their sins and enjoy eternal felicity in the society of angels.

Indulgences not sold? Why, the practice is to-day in Catholic countries as scandalous as the Catholic historian Lingard declares it was in the time of Luther. In the leading churches in Rome you will see over the door in large letters: *Indulgentia plenaria et perpetua pro vivis et defunctis*. As you are not as familiar with Latin as Father Gleeson's congregation, I will translate that for you, "Full and perpetual indulgences for the living and the dead." In the Church of St. Maria del Pace, it reads: "Every mass celebrated at this altar frees a soul from purgatory." In the Church of the Three Fountains, there is this inscription over a box: "To pay for masses to deliver souls from purgatory," and in the Church of St. Croce: "Every mass celebrated at this altar frees a soul from purgatory, by order of Pope Gregory XIII." And I affirm that an indulgence is a permission to commit sin.

Not long ago, you know the Duke of Aosta fell in love with his niece and

married her. He well knew that such a marriage was incestuous and unlawful in both Church and State. For a similar offence Popes Celestine III and Innocent III broke up the royal family of Spain, and ordered under penalty of excommunication, the wife to be torn from husband and children because of a marriage within forbidden degrees. But the Duke of Aosta sent the present Pope \$50,000 and obtained a dispensation—that is, in plain language a permission to commit incest. Was that a right to commit sin or not? I hope Father Gleeson will give us a categorical answer to that question.

Well, Mr. Travis and Swinton's History went out of the Boston schools for telling the ugly truth about Rome, and a blessed thing it was, for it woke up the old Puritan spirit, and the Puritans, thank God, have captured Boston! Whom the gods destroy, they first make mad, and it will be a sorry day of the Pope's legions when our patient and long-suffering people once wake up to the conspiracy being engineered from Rome against our public schools.

In Boston, thank God, the women vote on the election of school boards, and last September 25,000 women registered in Boston, though only 2,000 had been registered before! Nothing could stay the tide of public indignation! In vain the priests mustered their forces and instructed them in the confessional to vote to put down the Yankees, but the Yankees carried the day. Well, the priests have succeeded better in San Francisco than they did in Boston. Two years ago Professor Henry Sanger, then vice-principal of the Girl's High School, was dismissed from the place, or rather forced, as John Swett was, recently, to send in his resignation. I will give you Mr. Sanger's own words. In his letter he says: "When on the complaint of Rev. Father Gallagher, I was suspended last August (that is, two years ago), without proper trial, and in flagrant violation of the rules and regulations of the Board of Education, I intended, though I had been promptly reinstated, to resign at once, my position as teacher of the San Francisco Girl's High School.

"The earnest solicitations of leading citizens, the almost unanimous sympathy of my scholars, irrespective of creed or nationality, the hope that the future might bring a change, prevented me at that time from following my own inclination and serving my individual interests. But now, as in my opinion as a teacher, the new course prescribed for the Girl's High School is one beneath the grade of a high school, and as it cuts out the history of the Protestant Reformation from English history, a matter at once humiliating to me as an American citizen and embarrassing to me as a teacher, I now resign my position as assistant teacher of the San Francisco Girl's High School, to take effect at any time most convenient to your honorable board, not later than the first of August of this year."

How long are American people going to stand this meddling of a lot of foreign priests bound by an oath of allegiance to a foreign ruler with their dearest concerns—the education of their children? Last year Professor Lambert, assistant principal of the Lincoln school, had to resign because he united with the American party. It is a crime nowadays to be an American unless one is a hyphenated one. We ought not to admit anybody to this country unless they will agree to leave that hyphen behind them! All right to belong to the Clan-na-Gael, but not to the American party.

A Catholic priest complained of John Swett, principal of the Girl's High School, San Francisco, a man who has grown gray in the educational work of this State and in serving her highest interests, because he would not suppress history, and this year he was compelled to resign. Professor Templeton of our own Church, one of the first educators of this State for the past thirty years, for thirteen years a teacher of the Boys' High School in San Francisco, has just been dismissed to make room for one of the pets of the Roman Catholic bosses that rule San Francisco, one of whom has just died in the odor of sanctity. A week or two ago Dr. Harcourt, my fearless confrere, in Howard Street Church, San Francisco, learned that three Protestant teachers in the little village of Half Moon Bay and vicinity were dismissed for no other offense than that they were Protestants, and three far inferior Catholic teachers were substituted for them.

And so this damnable work of coercing teachers and parents and children

goes on. And yet Father Gleeson has the effrontery to stand up and tell us that our public school system is a mighty monstrous insatiable Moloch. "That it is not only unchristian but anti-Christian, infidel in character and tendency—thousands support it because they get their livelihood from it." (and that reminds of what Dr. McGlynn of New York says of the parochial schools, and he knows as much about them as any living man).

He says: "The extraordinary zeal manifested for getting up those parochial schools and institutions is, first of all, prompted by jealousy and rivalry of our public schools and institutions, and by the desire to keep children and other beneficiaries from the latter. Secondly, by the desire to make employment for and give comfortable homes to the rapidly increasing hosts of monks and nuns who make so-called education and so-called charity their regular business, for which a very common experience shows that they have but little qualification beyond their professional stamp and garb. It is not risking much to say if there were no public schools, there would be very few parochial schools, and the Catholic children, for all the churchmen would do for them, would grow up in brutish ignorance of letters, and a common-place of churchmen here would be the doctrine taught by the Jesuits of Italy in their periodical magazine, the *Civita Catholica*, that the people do not need to learn to read; that all they need is bread and the catechism."

Father Gleeson goes on to say that the increase of crime, immorality, and vice in this land is to be laid at the door of our public schools—that in Massachusetts, for example, where the Roman legions were recently routed horse, foot, and dragons, there is actually one arrest to every twenty-nine of the population, and all because the youth of the old Bay State are not gathered into parochial schools under the fostering care of Mother Church.

I am glad Massachusetts is referred to, and comparison between public and parish schools in that State challenged, for I have some instructive statistics on that very point, compiled from the census of 1870 by Hon. Dexter A. Hawkins:

To every 10,000 inhabitants:	Illiterates.	Paupers.	Criminals.
Roman Catholic schools produced.....	1400	410	160
Public schools of twenty-one States.....	350	170	75
Public schools of Massachusetts.....	71	49	11

I venture the statement that 75 per cent. of the arrests Father Gleeson refers to were of his own co-religionists, and that a clear majority of them enjoyed the advantage of attendance upon parish schools in this or the old country. He cites certain statistics proving the alarming increase of crime in Massachusetts between 1850 and 1854, and attributes this to the public schools. But how is it that while the public schools have existed in Massachusetts ever since 1642, there should have been so little crime, comparatively speaking, until the year 1850, when it began to accelerate at such a fearful rate? Why, it was precisely from 1850 on that the immigration of foreigners, especially Irish Roman Catholics, reached its highest in Massachusetts and New York, and, as observations and statistics abundantly prove, it is from this class of citizens that our almshouses, reformatories, and jails have been principally recruited.

But Father Gleeson's diatribes are only the echo of the utterances of able men in the same communion.

At a meeting held in St. Louis the Irish Catholic Benevolent Union, passed the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the present system of public schools, ignoring all supernatural authority and making God the first knowledge, the last thing to be learned, is a curse to our country, and a floodgate of atheism, of sensuality and of civil and social corruption." On that occasion Priest Phelan said, "The public men of America were educated in the public schools and were exhibitions of the system, and they were the most corrupt and dishonest of any country in the world. Men can steal in this country with impunity, provided the amount is large enough. That the children of the country go heels over head to the devil, must be attributed to the education they receive in the

public schools, which does not fit them for the temptations of the world. In these schools men of science are honored and enlogized, but the name of Jesus Christ is not allowed to be mentioned with reverence. These children turn out to be learned horse thieves, scholastic counterfeits, and well posted in all schemes of devilry."

Isn't it strange that these priests will allow members of their flock to have anything to do with such an institution? If Father Gleeson has such an opinion of our public schools he ought to take his parishioners off the board and out of the department and wash his hands of the whole iniquitous business.

If, as Father Gleeson says (and he was applauded by the Archbishop and by more than a score of priests when he said it) it is a sin for a Catholic to send his children to the public school, then it is a sin for any Catholic to have a hand in their administration, and simple honesty will command him to withdraw from the Board of Education, if he belongs to it, or from the school room if he or she be a teacher. The public school must be in the hands of its friends. No man should be tolerated for a day in the administration of our public schools who will not send his children to them if he has children.

I tell you fellow citizens, these statements are an infamous libel upon our public school system. They are lies that all the holy water in Oakland can't sanctify.

We are quite willing to compare our public men who have been educated in our free schools with the public men who have been educated in the schools of Rome. Call the roll of the graduates Rome's schools have turned out: Tweed, Sweeney, Connolly, A. Oakey Hall, Piggott the perjurer, O' Donovan Rossa, the Clan-na-gael, John Kelley, John Morrissey, John L. Sullivan, Zach. Montgomery, Boss Higgins, Boss Buckley. Shall I call the roll of the Boodle Aldermen of New York and Chicago? Go visit them in their cells and in Canada and their brogue will tell you where they were educated. Does Father Gleeson tell us that the common school fosters crime? Go into the prisons in this and other states, and ask the prisoners "what is your faith? In what faith were you reared?" And it is a low and conservative estimate that 75 per cent. will say, "in the Roman Catholic faith!" and that a majority of that 75 per cent. were once in the parish schools. Go to the drinking saloons in the cluster of cities around the bay and ask the rumsellers their religious faith or training, and 75 per cent. will say "Roman Catholic." It is not pleasant to me to make these comparisons. Please remember that I was not the first to make them!

But about the public men. Well, our common schools have produced such men as Charles Sumner and A. Lincoln and Henry Wilson and U. S. Grant and John A. Logan and Benjamin Harrison and Horace Greeley and James A. Garfield and Washington Bartlett. I think our public men will compare favorably with the output of the parochial schools.

But since comparison is challenged between the fruits of the two systems of education, American free schools and sectarian parish schools, I shall be happy to devote another sermon to an exhaustive comparison of them, and on next Sunday evening (D. V.) I will continue this discussion, taking for my theme "Public vs. Parochial Schools." I intend to show then, among other mighty interesting things, how in the parochial schools, and in the public schools where they obtain control of school boards, the Jesuits deliberately mutilate textbooks and falsify the truths of history.

And now permit me a word in closing. I have no prejudice against our Roman Catholic fellow citizens; indeed, with my friend Mr. Wendte, I believe that the rank and file are loyal to our institutions. It is the hierarchy that is plotting against our schools, and over the hierarchy the Catholic laity have no control. If the Roman Catholic Church, through her priesthood, were less inclined to meddle with matters of public policy outside of her sphere, we as Americans would have no special cause of suspicion or hostility toward her. Toward the members of that communion who are imitating the life and spirit of Christ I have only the most fraternal and kindly feelings. Should occasion require we would defend the religious liberty of our Catholic fellow citizens,

as we would our own, to the death. We are not the foes of Roman Catholics we wish them well; we would not harm a hair of their heads; we believe that we are working for their highest interests, and their children's, as well as our own, when we resist all aggression upon the common schools. But we say to these priests who are at the bottom of all this agitation and trouble: "We are tired of packed school boards, and falsified histories, and intimidated teachers, and scholars whipped by Irish priests for daring to attend a public school, and of hearing the public schools abused and slandered in the foulest language as hotbeds of immorality, as though they were reeking stews of vice and our gentle and refined teachers procuresses of hell. We are tired of it, and while you boast that the institution shall go down, though it be at the point of the bayonet, we say to you that it may go down, but some of us and a great many of you will die first!"

In the meanwhile we will pray for and reason with our friends, if haply they may come to a better mind. If not, they will find out that there are some things we hold dearer even than domestic peace and tranquillity, viz: the institutions which our fathers left us, which are as sacred to us as the prayers we learned at our mother's knees, and which we will defend, if need be, to our heart's last drop of blood.



"Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old he will not depart from it." Prov. 22:6.

---

# PUBLIC VS. PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

SERMON BY REV. E. R. DILLE, D. D.

DELIVERED AT OAKLAND, CAL., SEPT. 1, 1889.

---

My theme implies a certain antagonism between the common and the parochial school. Unfortunately there is antagonism between the common school and the Roman Catholic parochial school, because the aim of the former is to make good citizens, the aim of the latter to make good Catholics. The former seeks the full rounded development of the individual in his relations to society and the State; the latter seeks the production of a drilled and obedient servant of the Romish hierarchy. The common school is not in any just sense of the word irreligious, much less anti-Christian; it is simply non-religious in the sense that special instruction in religion is left by it where it belongs, to the home and the church. As Mr. Wendte says in his very able sermon on this question. "All our educators, of whatever shade of opinion, advocate and insist that ethical principles are and should be an important part of common school education." And I may add that the ethics that have a rightful place in the schools are Christian ethics. In one of the schools in San Francisco Herbert Spencer's Data of Ethics was introduced as a text book on morals—as palpable a violation of the law forbidding sectarian instruction as the introduction of the Catholic or Methodist catechism, for Herbert Spencer belongs to that very small and very narrow sect which promulgates the creed of agnosticism. A certain college president prepared a text book on Political Economy for use in the High schools. The work was submitted to a State educational committee for examination, and the reply came back to the author: "The very first sentence in your book is: 'The source of all wealth is the beneficence of God'—and this forbids us to use it in the public schools of this State, for it recognizes the divine existence." That committee were turning the schools over to a still smaller sect—the atheists. My friends, we do not want the schools either Romanized or Paganized; we believe it is in harmony with the genius of our institutions that the schools should teach a religiously grounded morality. The French atheistic system which excludes every text book which mentions God and puts the world's noblest literature on its index expurgatorius, is the antipodes of the American system as truly as is the Romish.

Morality—the principles of right conduct in the various relations of life and the universality and imperativeness of moral obligation, that broad moral basis on which society and commerce and government must rest, or fall in hideous ruin, belongs to the sphere of the teaching which is the proper function of the public school.

As Americans we do not propose to go either to Paris or to Rome for our educational methods. Our public schools are not in all respects adjusted to their environments as yet, but they can be. The just relation of church, family state and individual will be ascertained and adjusted, and while our schools will not be sectarian they will not be godless.

While the public schools then, though not irreligious, are unsectarian, the parochial schools are only sectarian, since they make the dogmas and practices of the Roman Church pre-eminent in their teaching. In proof of this I quote from the *Catholic World* of April 18, 1871: "We do not indeed prize so highly as some of our countrymen appear to do, the simple ability to read, write and

cipher. \* \* \* Some are born to be leaders, and the rest are born to be led, \* \* \* The best ordered and administered State is that in which the few are well educated and lead, and the many are trained to obedience, are willing to be directed—content to follow, and do not aspire to be leaders. \* \* \* In extending education and endeavoring to train all to be leaders, we have only extended presumptions, pretensions, conceit, indocility and brought incapacity to the surface. \* \* \*

"For the great mass of the people, the education needed is not secular education, which simply sharpens the intellect and generates pride and presumption, but moral and religious education \* \* \* which teaches them to be modest, docile and respectful to their superiors."

Cardinal Antonelli accurately expressed the spirit that dominates the parochial school, when he said that he "thought it better that children should grow up in ignorance than be educated in such a system of schools as the State of Massachusetts supports; that the essential part of education was the catechism; and while arithmetic and geography and other similar studies might be useful, they were not essential."

The late Archbishop Spaulding of Baltimore explicitly stated that the public school system of America was good for a republican government, but was bad for the Roman Catholic Church, because its tendency was culture in independence of thought and loyalty to the Republic first, and, necessarily, subservience of thought and loyalty to the Roman Church second.

The true purpose of the Romish hierarchy in establishing parochial schools was very plainly disclosed in an article which appeared some time ago in the *Tablet* of New York. The article was headed "How the Church Saves Society." The article states, with great plainness, a determination to "train up a nation of Roman subjects, within the nation of American citizens."

It is said that the poison of the cobra serpent becomes innocuous when exposed to the sun. So Romanism, whose virus has got into the blood of so many peoples, fears the light as it fears nothing else. Fellow citizens, we have in our midst a band of priestly conspirators, who have no sympathy for American Government or its system of education. They have been watching with sleepless vigilance every phase of our school system, and they have seen that our free schools are the nurseries of American ideas, and that a large number of children born of Roman Catholic parents, who were educated in these schools were so thoroughly Americanized in them that they were lost to the Church, and so at the command of the Pope they have gone to work to take possession of our schools—to control them or to destroy them. They are perfectly willing to control them, and though Father Gleeson calls the system Diana of the Ephesians, his co-religionists are quite willing to be priests and priestesses and temple sweepers for this Diana!

The priests of Rome would carry the abomination of desolation into the holy place of our public schools if they could. A lady of this city informs me that a priest conducted Romish services in the school in the Laguna district in San Mateo county—a public schools in which the teacher and most of the scholars were Catholics.

I agree with Father Gleeson (I am glad we are agreed on something) that the school question is a matter of life and death to his church; so much the worse for his church, say we. If the issue is between the two, if one or the other must go, the American people will not hesitate a moment. They will send every meddling priest home to Rome before they will see the system harmed. By the way, come to think of it, if these befrocked gentlemen don't like our institutions, why don't they leave our country for one where there are no "grim insatiable Molochs" in the shape of free schools to affright their souls? I'll agree to take up a rousing collection to pay their passage home, right here in Oakland!

Rome knows that it can only control the people by beginning at the beginning, before they are able to judge intelligently for themselves. That is why it has always put itself in opposition to popular education. It dreads the influence of our free schools upon its children, and is determined to overthrow them if possible. Now that Europe has become weary of her, and

the countries she has so long blighted are throwing off the incubus of priestcraft, she looks to America and thinks to take advantage of our liberal laws and our Protestant tolerance to set up here her throne of power; but to do that she must first destroy our common school system.

Our American schools are doomed because they foster liberty.

Bishop O'Connor, of Pittsburg, says: "Religious liberty is merely endured till the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world."

The Archbishop of St. Louis says: "If the Catholics ever gain, which they surely will, an immense numerical majority, religious freedom in this country will be at an end."

Here is a distinct announcement of the official authorities and the highest representative men of the Roman Catholic Church, of their purpose to tear down this great system of education. And for the reason, they say, it is in the way of the progress of the Catholic Church in America; that there can be no success in planting the Church in this Union while the free school system remains intact. "The fact is, Romanism and liberty cannot live on good terms. Where Romanism thrives, there liberty dies; and where liberty thrives, Romanism dies."

Dr. O. A. Brownson, in his *Catholic Review* of June, 1857, affirms that "Protestantism of every form has not, and never can have any *right where Catholicity is triumphant*." Very significant are the words of Pius the IX in his allocution to a Consistory of Cardinals, September, 1851. "We have taken this principle for basis: that the Catholic religion, with all its rights, ought to be exclusively dominant, in such sort that every other worship shall be banished and interdicted;" and while lamenting the progress of liberty, he adds, "It is a cause of supreme bitterness to the heart of the Holy Father not to be able otherwise to impose a limit to so much evil, as he certainly would if he could make use of other means to bridle their insane license."

James Anthony Froude, under the heading "What a Catholic Majority Could Do in America," shows clearly the political and educational tendencies of Roman Catholicism when in the ascendancy:

"We agree that the spiritual part of man ought to rule the material; the question is, where the spiritual part of man resides. The Protestant answers that it is in the individual conscience and reason; the Catholic says that it is in the Church and that it speaks through bishops and priests. Thus every true Catholic is bound to think and act as his priest tells him, and a Republic of true Catholics becomes a theocracy administered by the clergy. It is only as long as as they are a small minority that they can be loyal subjects under such a Constitution as the American. As their numbers grow, they will assert their principles more and more. Give them the power and the Constitution will be gone. A Catholic majority, under spiritual direction, will forbid liberty of conscience, and will try to forbid liberty of worship. It will control education, it will put the press under surveillance, it will punish opposition with excommunication, and excommunication will be attended with civil disabilities."

Father Hecker says: "The day will come when Romanists will take this country and build their institutions over the grave of Protestantism and then religious liberty is at an end."

The immortal La Fayette (himself a Catholic) said: "If ever the liberty of the American Republic is destroyed, it will be the work of Roman Catholic priests."

Now, while we question no man's right to hold the creed and practice the religious ceremonies which his judgment and choice commend to him, so long as the practice of his religion involves no infringement on others' rights, still an institution which claims for itself the right to control the primary education of citizens, is a proper subject of criticism and investigation.

To-day we have nearly a million of the future citizens and voters of this country in parochial schools, and all the power that Rome can bring to bear through, the pulpit and the confessional is being used to force all the children of Catholics into them. It is a fact full of promise to our nation that there is a strong tendency on the part of more enlightened Romanists to revolt from

the dictation of a lot of celibate priests in their most sacred domestic matters, and in spite of the thunders of the Vatican, the denials of the sacraments and the use of all the spiritual penalties which Rome has at her command, two-thirds of the children of Catholic families are still in our public schools, where they can obtain secular education without any of the musty flavor of monkery and mediævalism about it. Father Gleeson himself was told (so we are credibly informed) by one of his flock whom he commanded to take her children out of the public schools, to go to a warmer climate than Oakland, and a gentleman requested him with more force than politeness to mind his own business, when he invaded his home on a similar errand. Imagine any Protestant minister in this city interfering in that way with the domestic affairs of his people! And yet the reverend father sets himself up as the champion of parental rights!

The first question that demands solution in this discussion is: Has the State a right to educate? This the advocate of parochial schools emphatically deny, except under such limitations as practically reduce the function of the State to the task of providing the school funds, over the expenditure of which, however, it may have no control.

Father Conaty, of Worcester, Mass., at the opening of a new parochial school in Jamaica Plain last July, said: "The State as educator of its citizens, is a relic of barbarism."

The *Tablet*, a Roman Catholic journal, declares: "We hold education to be a function of the Church, not of the State; and in our case we do not and will not accept the State as educator."

A Papal encyclical says: "XLV. The Romish Church has a right to interfere in the discipline of the public schools, and in the arrangement of the studies and in the choice of the teachers for these schools.

"XLVII. Public schools open to all children for the education of the young should be under the control of the Romish Church, and should not be subject to the civil power nor made to conform to the opinions of the age."

Similarly *The Catholic World* says, "The Church asserts and defends these principles, and she flatly contradicts the assumption on the part of the State of the prerogative of education and determinedly opposes the effort to bring up the youth of the country for purely secular and temporal purposes. \* \*

\* While the State has rights, she has them only in virtue and by permission of the superior authority, and that authority can only be expressed through the Church." Vol. 2, p. 439.

Dr. Brownson in his review said: "The attention of the Catholic world has been directed to this subject by those whom God has sent to rule over us, and a struggle which will end in a victory for the Church, has begun between Catholicity and the State, to see who shall have the child."

Better languish and die under the red flag of England, than to live to beget children of perdition under the flag of a proselyting republic." (*Catholic Celt* of Buffalo.)

And Father Gleeson says: "... here we have forced on us by the will of the majority, a system of instruction which we are ready to show has been and is robbing our little ones by the thousand and by the million of what is dearer to them than their very existence—the faith of their fathers'. Who gave the State the absolute dominion over the finances of the whole country for such an ignoble purpose as this? Was it the object for which the public school system of this country was established, to destroy the faith of the Catholic people?"

Now this proposition: That the State has a right to educate, which we affirm and Romanists deny, is a vital one in this connection. The public schools stand or fall with the right of the State to educate. Father King, for whom I have sincere respect, says that we Protestants have no occasion to champion the Government as against the Church, as the Government is abundantly able to take care of itself.

May I venture to remind the venerable Father that in a republic the *people* are the Government—the State? Politically, the State with us is the whole people exercising the functions of self conservation and self government. The State is the organic people, and as such has certain rights and duties—

for these are always correlatives. And the ground of the common school is the right and duty of the State to educate the whole people to such an extent and in such fashion as will secure the preservation of the State and the development of its life.

Daniel Webster, the great expounder of the Constitution, said: "The power of education is one of the powers of public police belonging essentially to the government. It is one of the powers, the exercise of which is indispensable to the preservation of society with integrity and healthy action; it is the duty of self protection."

1. The State must educate because its political safety depends upon it. The conservative and guiding forces of a republic do not reside in a power outside of and above the people—they reside in the people—in the minds and wills of the many who by their opinions and votes determine the policy of the Government and the character of its rulers. Ignorance is a perpetual invitation to anarchy with its torch on the one hand and the man on horseback on the other. In this country it is the ignorance of many voters that makes the opportunity of the bosses and the demagogues.

2. The State must educate because commercial and industrial prosperity and material progress of every kind depend on general intelligence. In 1870, the Commissioner of Education at Washington instituted a long and searching investigation of the whole industrial field to determine the relative productiveness of literate and illiterate labor. The investigation developed the following facts:

1. "That an average free, common school education, such as is provided in all the States where the free common school has become a permanent institution, adds fifty per cent. to the productive power of the laborer, considered as a mere productive machine.

2. That the average Academical education adds 100 per cent.

3. That the average Collegiate or University education adds from 200 to 300 per cent. to the worker's average annual productive capacity—to say nothing of the vast increase of his manliness."

4. The State must educate, because the well-being of the nation depends upon its morality, and that is in direct ratio to the general diffusion of intelligence, as the statistics of the relation of crime to illiteracy clearly demonstrate.

In France, in 1868, one-half of the inhabitants could neither read nor write. From this half came ninety-five per cent. of the persons arrested for crime. From the other half came only five per cent. In a word, a given number of children suffered to grow up in ignorance produced nineteen times as many criminals as the same number produced who were educated at least to the extent of the elementary branches.

In the six New England States, in 1870, only seven per cent. of the inhabitants above ten years of age were unable to read and write; yet this seven per cent. produced eighty per cent. of the criminals. That is, the proportion of criminal illiterates to criminal literates was fifty-three to one. This fact sufficiently vindicates the moral effect of the New England system of public education against Cardinal Manning's charge in the *Forum*, which Father Gleeson quotes.

5. The State must educate because many parents have not the means nor the motives for the education of their children. The parental right of control over children is not absolute. It has certain limitations in the natural rights of children. The equity of laws compelling the attendance of children at school during certain years of their life is based not only on the right of the State to protect itself, but upon its right and duty to protect its defenceless wards, the children of parents too ignorant or vicious to educate them.

6. The State must educate in order to bring about that social homogeneity which is vital to a republic. Aristocracy intrenches and perpetuates itself in private schools. But in the common school the children of rich and poor meet on a common level, and all through the school course a sort of leveling process goes on—a leveling up and not down, for the tendency is to lift the whole school to the level of the best and most refined elements in it. The

common school is the natural foe of caste and of foreignism, and the process of assimilation which goes on there is of tremendous importance in this country, where we have annually from five to eight hundred thousand immigrants coming to us from foreign lands. Imagine the effect, if the children of our foreign population should be segregated into schools where foreign ideas should be sedulously taught, and should grow up in as dense ignorance of our institutions as their fathers are when they land at Castle Garden—how long would this nation stand the strain? I tell you it is a glorious thing for broadcloth and homespun, the children of Hans and Pat and Jonny Crapaud and John Bull and Brother Jonathan to rub up against each other in the public schools. There our lads learn to clasp hands in a mutual respect born of something broader and better than class or race or creed distinctions—distinctions about which the wholesome public school boy, thank God, cares precious little. It is the function then of the common school:

1. To furnish a wholesome and thorough primary mental training for every child in the land.

2. To make good citizens by inculcating those principles of morality, patriotism and true social life, without which a republic, however rich its resources, and however favorable its natural situation, cannot long endure and prosper.

Such is the ground and theory of the common school. The parochial school, on the other hand, is based on the assumption that the Roman Catholic Church is the infallible representative of God on earth; that as Cardinal Manning says, the Pope alone has the right to define the limits of his own authority and the limits of the authority of the State; that it is the Pope's duty to pronounce not only on the rights of individuals, but of people, nations and their rulers.

Father McNally indignantly denies that Catholics would throw their country aside and be recreant to their principles of patriotism if Rome should call on them to do so, and adds: "How could the Pope influence us if he would?" Over against that utterance of Father McNally I put the words of Bishop Gilmour: "Nationalities must be subordinate to religion. We must learn that we are Catholics first, citizens next. Catholicism teaches that the Church is above the State."

Cardinal Newman said to Mr. Gladstone: "No pledge (of civil allegiance) is of any value from Catholics to which Rome is not a party," thus fully justifying the charge of the Grand Old Man whom Father Gleeson quotes with such unction that consistent "Catholics hold their loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another."

On page 278 of a book prepared for the use of the Roman colleges and schools by the Rev. F. X. Schouppe of the Society of Jesuits, and bearing the imprimatur of Cardinal Manning, we are told that, "The civil laws are binding on the conscience only so long as they are conformable to the rights of the Catholic Church," and on page 279 that human laws are susceptible of dispensation. The power to dispense belongs to the sovereign Pontiff." This is plain language. It cannot be misunderstood. Civil laws are not binding when they conflict with the decrees of the Pope.

The second assumption which lies at the basis of parochial schools is that the Roman Catholic Church is the supreme authority in all education; that the end of education is to make obedient and capable servants of the Church; and that therefore the Church must have supreme control of the means and methods of education.

The *Catholic Review* for April, 1871, said: "We deny, of course as Roman Catholics, the rights of the civil government to educate; for education is a function of the spiritual society as much as preaching."

A Catholic Dictionary, edited by William E. Addis and Thomas Arnold, bearing the imprimatur of Henry E. Manning, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, declares that: "The first and highest authority in all that regards education is the Church. With her sanction it should be commenced, and under her superintendence it should be continued."

I come now to the practical results which the spirit and method of the parochial school invariably produce.

The assault upon free popular education which is made here, is successful in all Catholic countries. In Quebec the Jesuits have captured the funds which have been raised by taxation for high schools, and as Mr. Pixley well says: "We Americans now enjoy the unusual privilege of seeing the garroter who has determined to strangle us to-morrow perform the operation of choking the victim he has selected for to-day." If we are wise, forewarned will be forearmed, and the fingers that now clutch the Canadian throat will be handcuffed before they embrace our jugular vein.

1. What has been the practical result of Romish schools in the Old World? Listen to Count Cavour, the Italian statesman, the prime minister of United Italy. He says: "Nothing hurts Rome so much as the light; I will attack Rome by railways, by electric telegraphs, by agricultural implements, by gratuitous education on a large scale, by civil marriages, by the secularization of conventual property, by the enactment of a model code, embodying the most lenient laws of Europe, and by the suppression of corporeal punishment. I will place the spirit of modern expansion face to face with the old spirit of obscurantism. I am quite certain the former will triumph. I will establish a blockade of new civilization around Rome. If she undergoes a modification, she will come to us; if she remains unchanged, she will by constant comparison become so disgusted with her state of inferiority that she will throw herself into our arms to escape destruction."

What the prime minister predicted has come to pass; for free Italy has become too hot to hold his Holiness, the Pope, and he is talking of emigrating to some land still in the twilight of mediævalism, like Spain or Portugal.

Victor Hugo, the greatest genius of this century, saw what Romish schools meant in France, and he says of them:

"Ah, we know you! We know the clerical party; it is an old party. This it is which has found for truth those two marvelous supports, ignorance and error. This it is which forbids to science and genius the going beyond the missal, and which wishes to cloister thought in dogmas. Every step which the intelligence of Europe has taken has been in spite of it. Its history is written in the history of human progress, but it is written on the back of the leaf. It is opposed to it all. \* \* \*

"For a long time the human conscience has revolted against you and now demands of you, 'What is it that you wish of me?' For a long time you have tried to put a gag upon the human intellect. You wish to be the masters of human education, and there is not a poet, nor an author, nor a thinker, nor a philosopher that you accept. All that has been written, found, dreamed, deduced, inspired, imagined, invented by the genius, the treasures of civilization, the venerable inheritance of generations, the common means of knowledge, you reject. You claim the liberty of teaching. Stop! be sincere. Let us understand the liberty you claim. It is the liberty not to teach."

Who is this Rome, fellow citizens, that comes to us with this arrogant claim that God has committed to her the exclusive function of educating the youth of this land?

Who is this that claims that our school system is godless and impious, unfit for the education of her children? Who is this that would rend asunder our school system, the palladium of the American Republic? What has been her record in the work of education? What superior enlightenment has she imparted to the nations that have long been under her dominion? What type of civilization has she fostered? What progress in morality, piety, the arts and sciences, and in social amenities?

Gattiani, a member of the Italian Parliament, speaking of what the Papal church has done in the line of progress and in the line of civilization asks:

"What share has the Papacy taken in this work—is it the press? Is it electricity? Is it steam? Is it chemical analysis? Is it self-government? Is it the principle of nationality? Is it the proclamation of the rights of man? Of the liberty of conscience? Of all this the Papacy is the negation. Its culminating points are Gregory I, who, like Omar, burnt libraries; Gregory VII

who destroyed a moiety of Rome and created the temporal sovereignty; Innocent the III, who founded the Inquisition; Boniface IX, who destroyed the last remains of municipal liberty in Rome; Pius VII, who committed the same wrong in Bologna; Alexander VI, who established the censorship of books; Paul III, who published the bull for the established of the Jesuits; Pius V, who covered Europe with burning funeral pyres; Urban VIII, who tortured Galileo; and Pius IX, who has given us the modern syllabus.

This is the power that is striving to undermine, destroy, or control the educational interests of our land. It put Campanella seven times to the torture for saying that the number of worlds was infinite. It persecuted Harvey for proving the circulation of the blood. In the name of Jesus, it shut up Galileo for having said that Jupiter had moons. It imprisoned Christopher Columbus. To find a new world was heresy; to discover a new law of the heavens was impiety. It was this spirit that anathematized Pascal in the name of religion; Montaigne in the name of morality, and Moliere in the name of both morality and religion."

I do not deny that the Church of Rome has done good educational work in all the ages, for which the world is greatly her debtor; but it was the education of limited classes—never of the people. Her education was for the cloister and the castle, and not for the yeomanry and peasantry of Europe. It has ever been her policy to keep the masses ignorant, in harmony with her time honored maxim that "ignorance is the mother of devotion."

In the Papal States before the downfall of the Pope's temporal power, although the Romish Church had absolute control of all affairs both temporal and spiritual, 80 per cent. of the people could neither read nor write, and only 5 per cent. could read and write, and an American official stationed there said that the humblest district school in the backwoods of America was infinitely superior to the parochial schools of Rome. The leading institutions of the Eternal City were churches, monasteries, and foundling asylums—the latter by no means least important in a land where the proportion of illegitimate births was larger than in any other country in Christendom.

A gentleman of my acquaintance made the statement to me that while visiting Ireland he was gratified to see the country dotted all over with the Board school-houses, the national schools built by the British government, to try to lift the Irish race from the slough of ignorance, idleness, and bigotry, into which centuries of priestly instruction had brought them. But while driving across the country he saw a Catholic priest standing with a whip in his hand to scourge back the Irish gossoons who might have the temerity to approach the National schoolhouse. That was in Ireland; but we have a companion to the picture.

In New England, in Cambridgeport, Mass., not a great while ago, a few Catholic parents refused to send their children to Father Scully's parochial school. Against these parents Father Scully directed all the ecclesiastical weapons at his command. He refused them the sacraments, denied them absolution, and commanded his flock to shun them *as if they were Protestants*. One boy who went to the public school was placed by Father Scully upon a table and his back lashed till for two weeks he could not lie down on account of the wounds. Archbishop Williams was appealed to and sustained Father Scully in his heroic measures for the suppression of the public school heresy in his parish. Under the parochial schools of the Romish Church the people of Catholic Ireland and Italy have fallen so far behind other races in intelligence that they have become mere hewers of wood and drawers of water for the nations that sustain a system of free public education abreast of the age. Look at Spain, where Rome has controlled all education for ages. Seventy per cent. of the population could neither read nor write in 1864, though Spain had fifty-eight colleges, with 14,000 students in them—nearly all priests and monks being trained to prey upon the ignorance and superstition of the people. In Spain to-day, with 16,000,000 people, 12,000,000 can neither read nor write. Victor Hugo said to Rome: "What have you done for Spain? Spain, magnificently endowed Spain, which received from the Romans her first, and from the Arabs her second civilization; from Providence, in spite of you, a world—America—Spain,



thanks to you, rests under a yoke of stupor, degradation, and decay. Spain has lost the secret of the power it obtained from the Romans, the genius of art it obtained from the Arabs, the new world it had from God; and it has received from you, in exchange for all you have made it lose, the Inquisition, which some of you are trying to reestablish; which has burned on the funeral pyre millions of men, which disinterred the dead to burn them as heretics. That is what you have done for two great nations, and that is what you want to do for France. Take care: France is a lion and is alive." After this masterpiece of sarcasm from the illustrious Hugo, look over Mexico, Central and South America, after nearly four centuries of Catholic education. Who dares deny that Roman Catholic countries in both hemispheres are the least educated? that in them is the deepest, densest ignorance and the grossest morals and the most unpardonable loitering in the march of human progress that is to be found in Christendom? while Germany, Switzerland, Norway, England, and the United States are the best instructed countries in the world, because they each have a national system of instruction.

The great English historian, Macaulay, in speaking of the manifest superiority of Protestantism over Romanism in his day, said: "When in Ireland, you pass from a Catholic to a Protestant country, in Switzerland, from a Catholic to a Protestant Canton, or in Germany from a Catholic to a Protestant State, you feel you are passing from a low to a high civilization."

The Roman Church has had charge of Mexico for 300 years, and what is Mexico to-day? Rev. Dr. Green, visiting at Pachmca, writing to Rev. Dr. J. M. King, of New York, says: "Potatoes sell for a penny apiece, and you buy them one at a time, for the seller cannot count." Think of it, Father Gleeson; in 300 years your parochial schools in Mexico have not taught the people to count two potatoes! In Ireland they have taught the people to count potatoes, and not much else, except the catechism. In the same letter Dr. Green says; "Yesterday was Sunday, and the Lord Archbishop attended the bull-fight after mass in his clerical robes, and applauded the fun, and graciously remarked that it was one of the most skillful he had ever seen." The good Archbishop doesn't have his Sunday *dolce far niente* interfered with, as does Father Gleeson, by having to warn his flock against free schools! In Mexico and the South American States the Roman hierarchy has controlled education for ages, and the result is pauperism, ignorance, disorder and lawlessness. Are you ready, fellow citizens, to turn your lambs over to the tender mercies of these wolves in sheep's clothing?

Look again at South America. It has a decided advantage over our land in climate, soil, and mineral resources. But Romanism has rested like a pall upon that fair land. Thank God, that dark pall is being lifted, and Brazil, Chili, Peru, and the Argentine Republic are revolting from the rule of Rome, expelling the accursed Jesuits, and awakening to a nobler national life.

But to bring this question nearer home to everyone who hears me, I propose to show what is taught in the parochial schools of this as well as of other lands. The Romanists demand a share of the school funds, to be applied to the support of parochial schools. I want you to know what they are asking you to pay for, that if you accede to their demands, you may do so with your eyes open.

A Prussian proverb affirms that what is to appear in the life of a nation must first be put into its elementary schools. I want to show what is being drilled into nearly a million children in this country, half of whom are destined to be our future voters and office holders, and the other half to wield still more influence as wives and mothers.

The political power of Romanism depends upon the unity of the Catholic population at the polls, and that depends upon the success of the parochial schools.

Take first the catechism, which is placed first in the curriculum of parochial schools. The catechism which I quote from is authorized by the Third Plenary Council at Baltimore.

After teaching the infallibility of the Pope and the doctrine that the sacramental bread and wine are changed by the celebrant of the mass into the veritable body and blood of Christ, it goes on to teach the children of our Cath-

olic neighbors that our Protestant marriages are not valid, although it does not call them as did Archbishop Alemany, "a filthy concubinage."

I quote. "What is the sacrament of matrimony?"

Answer. The sacrament of matrimony is the sacrament which unites a Christian man and woman in lawful marriage.

Question. Can a Christian man and woman be united in lawful marriage in any other way than by the sacrament of matrimony? Ans. "They cannot, because Christ raised matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament."

It is in harmony with this delectable teaching that you are asked to pay for, that Archbishop Riordan publishes a circular and sends it to his flock every year, telling them that all who have been married by Protestant ministers or magistrates are living in adultery.

"Q. Again: If the Catholic Church is to lead all men to eternal salvation and has for that purpose, received from Christ her doctrine, her means of grace and her powers, what, for his part, is every one obliged to do?"

"A. Every one is obliged, under pain of eternal damnation, to become a member of the Catholic Church, to believe her doctrine, to use her means of grace, and to submit to her authority."

I quote another book prepared by Jesuits for the tender minds of your neighbor's children. It is printed in Baltimore under the license of the late Archbishop Bailey:

"Q. Have Protestants any faith in Christ?"

"A. They never had."

"Q. Why not?"

"A. Because there never lived such a Christ as they imagine and believe in."

"Q. In what kind of a Christ do they believe?"

"A. In such a one of whom they can make a liar with impunity, whose doctrine they can interpret as they please, and who does not care what a man believes, provided he be an honest man before the public."

"Q. Will such a faith in such a Christ save Protestants?"

"A. No sensible man will assert such an absurdity."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Q. Are Protestants willing to confess their sins to a Catholic bishop or priest who alone has power from Christ to forgive sins?"

"A. No; for they generally have an utter aversion to confession, and, therefore, their sins will not be forgiven them throughout all eternity."

"Q. What follows from this?"

"A. That they die in their sins, and are damned."

In Father Gury's "Compendium of Moral Theology,"—and this famous book is in use in Jesuit colleges throughout the world—it is taught that he who has sworn to marry a young woman rich and healthy, is not bound by his oath should she happen to become poor, or fall into bad health; that servants or person employed on salaries, who are of the opinion that their wages are inferior for the work done by them, may make use of clandestine compensation, which is defined as consisting in the recovery of what is due by invasion of another person's property. Here are all the references, and if anybody wishes to come to me and verify these quotations, this book is at his service.

Here is what the parochial school books teach about the reformers: A book written by Father Baddeley, published in Boston, which Catholic children are obliged to commit to memory, speaking of Martin Luther, says; "What! can a man who was mad with lust, who lived in adultery and caused others to do the same—who wrote most horrid blasphemy, and corrupted the Bible, who was a notorious drunkard and companion of devils, who was as proud as Satan himself, a preacher of sedition and murder: what! can this *wretch* be compared with Paul?"

A book bearing the title "Plain Talk About the Protestants of To-day," which is placed in the hands of young Catholics contains these statements: "Martin Luther died forlorn of God—blaspheming to the very end. His last word was an attestation of impenitence. His eldest son, who had doubts both about the Reformation and the Reformer, asked him for a last time whether he persevered in the doctrine he preached. 'Yes,' replied a gurgling sound from

the old sinner's throat—and Luther was before his God! Calvin died of scarlet fever, devoured by vermin, and eaten up by an ulcerated abscess, the stench whereof drove away every person. In great misery he gave up his rascally ghost, despairing of salvation, evoking the devils from the abyss, and uttering oaths most horrible and blasphemies most frightful."

Of Fox's "Book of Martyrs" this same treatise says: "These saints were nothing but a set of deluded, rebellious, impious, and blasphemous wretches."

Coming to history, we find that the parochial schools use textbooks that are dishonest and deficient in their teaching of this branch of knowledge—deficient because vital facts of history or suppressed or obscured—dishonest, because glaring misstatements are made in the interest of the Catholic Church.

Let us examine some of these pious frauds with which Jesuitism feeds the lambs of its flock.

When Swinton's History was banished from the Boston public schools at the demand of the priests, Anderson's General History was substituted, but not until it had been mutilated and Romanized by the change and substitution of whole pages. All that referred to the persecution of the Lollards and Albigenses, to the contest between Pope Boniface VIII and Philip IV of France, which resulted in the Pope's retirement to Avignon for seventy years is omitted and the massacre of St. Bartholomew partially justified, the Huguenots being declared to be the aggressors, and the number massacred is given at 10,000 instead of 100,000.

But the history used in the parochial schools of this city takes the palm for whitewashing that infamous and hellish massacre. I have it in my hand—"Compendium of History, by John O'Kane Kerney."

Bismarck said that the saddest sight he saw in France during the invasion of it by the German armies was not battle fields covered with dead and dying, but mutilated misleading text books in children's desks in Catholic schools. Such school books are now scattered over the continent by millions. Listen to the mendacity of this instructor of youth. I want you to hear it, boys and girls of our High and Grammar schools, parents and teachers.

It gives the number who fell on that day at 786. It says that Pope Gregory XIII, on receiving the account of the transaction—*transaction* is good for the massacre of 100,000 men, women and children—offered up public thanks, not that he rejoiced in the death of the supposed traitors, but for the preservation of the French Monarch and his kingdom from ruin.

And then it caps the climax of shameless falsehood by adding the following foot-note by Cardinal Gibbons: "*Religion* had nothing to do with the massacre. Coligny and his fellow Huguenots were slain, *not* on account of their creed, but *exclusively* on account of their alleged treasonable designs. If they had nothing but their Protestant faith to render them odious to King Charles, they would never have been molested."

And Bishop Gilmour's history says: "As to the solemn *Te Deum* sung at Rome by order of Pope Gregory XIII, it was done under the impression that the massacre was begun on the part of the Calvinists, that the King's party acted in self defense, and that the affair grew out of an unsuccessful conspiracy against the French Government and Catholic Church." Religion nothing to do with it! Why every schoolboy here knows that it was the slaughter-breathing letters of the Pope that prompted that fiend in human shape, Charles IX, to the massacre of St. Bartholomew. The Pope commanded him to follow the example of the Israelites in slaying the Amalekites, and other heathen nations, and to "utterly extirpate the roots of so great an evil." "It is your duty," he said, "to be deaf to every prayer, to reject every claim of consanguinity and kindred; to manifest yourself inexorable to every voice which may dare to petition for the most impious of men; and to that holy task, as it becomes our pastoral office and our pastoral affection, we think it fitting to stimulate you by this fatherly admonition." In obedience to these injunctions, Charles IX, on the evening of August 23, 1572, issued orders for the massacre by which 100,000 of the best citizens of France were murdered in cold blood. And yet American children are being taught that the Church had nothing to do with the blackest crime of all the ages!

Such lies are like the fathers of them, gross as a mountain, open, palpable. Like the system they are forged to maintain, they are begotten in sin and conceived in iniquity.

The same veracious chronicle tells us that the Romish priest and prelates had nothing to do with the death of those who suffered by the Inquisition; that all the priestly council ever did was to declare men guilty and turn them over to the civil authorities; that all the arms the priesthood used to extirpate heresy were prayer, patience and instruction!

As an instructive comment on that, I quote the following translation from a recent number of the *Catholic Banner*, the organ of the Papal Church at Barcelona, Spain: "Thank God, we at last have turned toward the times when those who propagated heretical doctrines were punished with exemplary punishment. The re-establishment of the Holy Tribunal of the Inquisition must soon take place. Its reign will be more glorious and fruitful in results than in the past. Our Catholic heart overflows with faith and enthusiasm, and the immense joy which we experience as we begin to reap the fruit of our present campaign exceeds all imagination. What a day of pleasure will that be for us when we see anti-clericals writhing in the flames of the Inquisition!" To arouse and encourage them to begin another crusade the same paper says: "We believe it right to publish the names of those holy men under whose hands so many sinners suffered, that good Catholics may venerate their memory."

By Torquemada—	
Men and women burnt alive.....	10,220
By Diego Deza—	
Men and women burnt alive.....	2,592
By Cardinal Jimenez de Cisneros—	
Men and women burnt alive.....	3,564
By Adrian de Florencia—	
Men and women burnt alive.....	1,620
Total number of men and women burnt alive under the ministry of	
forty-five holy Inquisitor Generals.....	35,364
Total number burnt in effigy.....	18,637
Total number condemned to other punishments.....	293,533
Total.....	347,704

huc Taking up other Catholic text books we find in the preface to the "Third Reader of the Catholic National Series," more largely used than any other in the parochial schools this naive statement: "The Third Reader, in common with the other books of the 'Catholic National Series,' has one chief characteristic, viz.: a thoroughly Catholic tone, which will be found to pervade the whole book." Imagine a school book commended to our approval by the statement that it had "a thoroughly Baptist," or "Methodist," or "Episcopalian tone" for use in any of our denominational colleges, much less in our public schools.

The table of contents prefixed to "The Third Reader" contains among others equally suggestive, the following titles: "Bessie's First Mass," "St. Germaine Cousin," "The Weight of a Prayer," "Pope Leo XIII and the Brigands," "The Legend of the Infant Jesus Serving at Mass," "How to be a Nun," "St. Bridget" and "St. Francis of Assisi." "The Weight of a Prayer" relates that a woman went into a butcher shop and asked for meat. When the butcher inquired what she had to give for it, she answered, "Nothing but my prayers." The butcher says that prayers will not pay rent and buy cattle. But inclined to joke, he says he will give her as much meat as her prayer will weigh. Thereupon he writes the poor woman's prayer on a slip of paper and puts it on one side of the scale and puts a tiny bit of meat on the other side. To his astonishment the paper does not rise. He puts on a larger piece. Still the paper remains down. Then in fright he puts on the scale a large round of beef, and turning to the woman, acknowledges the evident hand of God, and in penitence promises her in the future all the meat

she may want. In this book are several other instances of modern miracles of similar character.

In the third reader used in the parochial schools of this city (which schools you are asked to support by taxation) the lessons have such titles as "The Rosary" and "Hail Mary," in the latter of which a Catholic child expounds to a benighted Protestant playmate the benefits of praying to the Blessed Virgin. Now do our Catholic friends think it is good for them or their children to make denominationalism the chief characteristic of their books, especially of their children's books? Surely we do not want Catholic reading books and Methodist spelling books and Jewish geographies and Baptist histories and Presbyterian grammars and Episcopalian arithmetics! There is nothing sectarian in the multiplication table, and there ought not to be in history, which concerns itself simply with facts. Now the question is are citizens of this free Republic doing their duty when they allow their children to be systematically taught that "all Protestant countries are strongholds of bigotry and intolerance," that "the Holy See has been God's instrument in conferring upon Europe every blessing it enjoys"—that "to Catholics are due all the valuable inventions we have," that "the only bond of unity between Protestants is their hostility to Catholicity," that "the Thirty Years' War was a Lutheran rebellion?" Is it the honest way to teach history to justify the horrors of the Inquisition and the massacre of St. Bartholomew—to say as does Bishop Gilmour's History: "Romanism has ever appealed to reason; Protestantism, like Mohamedanism to force and violence?" But we are told it is nobody's business what we Catholics teach in our own schools. May we not do what we will with our own? No, you may only do what is right with your own—what is consistent with public safety.

If the Roman Church or any other church desires to found parochial schools, well and good, provided they are supported by the Church and not by the State, and provided attendance upon them is voluntary, and not enforced by religious threats, and the instruction shall be equal in character to that provided by the State; and provided that patriotism and loyalty to the Republic be inculcated in the minds of the pupils. There must be no perversion of the common school fund. We must continue to have American schools for the education of American citizens.

Father Gleeson quotes Rev. Dr. Platt as saying that "the public schools are not calculated to build up Protestantism." Certainly not. The public schools are not a religious propaganda—they were not founded and they are not maintained to make either Protestants or Catholics, but to make Americans—a majestic fact that is beyond the comprehension of some narrow Protestants as well as Catholics. If Protestantism cannot stand the light, I say let it go to the wall.

But what do the children in the parochial schools learn about the history of our own country? Sadlier's smaller geography—a textbook that is very popular in the parochial schools—that probably contains all the American history that the poorer scholars ever learn, and it is enough of the kind, contains just fifteen questions and answers on the history of the founding of this nation, and nearly half of the space occupied by them is devoted to glorifying the Catholic Church. All that it says about the Puritans in America is that they were very intolerant. Sadlier's larger history says: "The *only* systematic and successful attempts to civilize and Christianize the Indians were made by Catholic missionaries." "The independence of the United States was, in a *great degree*, secured by Catholic blood, talent and treasure."

It devotes twice the space to Archbishop Hughes that it does to Abraham Lincoln, and gives twenty-eight lines to George Washington and thirty-seven to Father Peter de Smet, whosoever he may be.

Why, the inferiority of the parochial system, its utter inefficiency, is confessed by the Baltimore Council of 1866, which says: "It is a melancholy fact and a very humiliating avowal for us to make that a very large proportion of the idle and vicious youth of our principal cities are the children of Catholic parents," and then it goes on to advise the establishment of protectorates and reformatories.

And Dr. O. A. Brownson, to whom the Catholics are erecting a statue, said that Catholics must become Americans—that so far they are a foreign colony in this country, representing a civilization inferior to the American. He says that Catholic schools fail to recognize human progress, and tend to repress rather than quicken the intellectual life of the pupil and to unfit rather than to prepare him for his social duties.

In 1881 the *Freeman's Journal* (Catholic) called the parochial schools "apologies, compromises; systemless pretenses," in which a smattering of the catechism is supplied to fit the children for the duties of life."

And now I will not leave this branch of my subject without a word for Father Gleeson, who I take it, is personally a very pleasant gentleman, albeit afflicted with an "ecclesiastical impediment" which sometimes prevents his giving a straightforward yes or no to a civil question, and with a race instinct which prompts him now and then to shoot from behind the hedge. He is by no means deficient in a certain genial Celtic sense of humor, and he ought to see the exquisite comicality of his change of front on the public school question since the 11th of August. Can it be the same fiery Peter the Hermit who preached a crusade on that day against the schools and who now "roars as gently as any sucking dove," and says "we are being unjustly accused. All in the world we want is a reformation, a perfecting of the system." Has some prudent prelate curbed his zeal, or has he, like Frankenstein, called forth a giant in the shape of public indignation that he cannot conjure down?

He says I used violent language. I take you to witness that the only menacing or incendiary language in my sermon was the following uttered by Monsignor Capel, a prelate of the Romish Church: "The time is not far away when the Roman Catholics, at the order of the Pope, will refuse to pay their school tax, and will send bullets to the breasts of the Government agents rather than pay. The order can come any day from Rome. It will come as quickly as the click of a trigger, and it will be obeyed of course, as coming from God Almighty himself."

A threat that may explain why it is that the Roman Catholic secret society, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, have a military branch and in all our cities is drilling its armed battalions in secret—battalions bound by an oath to put church above country and to admit none but Roman Catholics to their rendezvous, and to present an unbroken front to the enemies of the church.

Fellow citizens, there are two Christian ladies in this congregation to-night who were present when the worshipers were fired upon in the churches in the city of Philadelphia once by Romish rioters who were frenzied by the assaults of priests upon the public schools.

That will not happen again, because Americans are learning that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty!

I believe there are multitudes of Catholics who are as genuine Americans and as genuine Christians as any of the men and women I address to-night.

Of them we have no fear; they are indeed the hope of our land. To political priests we say, "Hands off! Eternal separation of Church and State! No sectarian appropriations! No dividing of the School fund!"

Fellow citizens, let us stand by our schools; let us take a practical interest in them. Let us favor a broad and liberal policy for buildings and maintenance. Let us ask our Council to appropriate that 40 per cent. of the school tax levy which the charter makes available, for the erection of school buildings worthy of our city and our schools, so that the enthusiasm you have shown when the schools are attacked may prove itself to be more than a mere barren sentiment. I thank God for this agitation. It has done good, and the people have spoken in no uncertain tones, to the dismay and confusion of the enemies of American free schools.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 029 445 894 3